AN APPEAL

To the Right Reverend

EDWARD

Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*,

AND THE

Reverend Dr. *EDWARDS*,

Principal of *JESUS* Coll. *Oxon*;

For an Impartial Deciſion of the

CONTROVERSIE

BETWEEN

Mr. *W.* and *S. L.*

About the

Great Doctrine of Chriſt's *Satisfaction.*

In Order to the

Settlement of the Brethren on both ſides in the Sound Faith thereof, againſt *SOCINIANISM.*

By **Stephen Lobb.**

GALAT. ii. 2.

Communicated that Goſpel, which I Preach unto them, that were of Reputation, *leaſt by any means I ſhould Run, or had Run in vain.*

London, Printed for **Nath. Hiller**, at the *Princes-Arms* in *Leadenhall-ſtreet*, over againſt St. *Mary-Axe*, 1698.

TO THE
READER.

THE *Clearing of Truth in Order to Peace, being my Deſign; I have waved the Examination of ſuch* Papers, *as have been Publiſhed againſt me ſince the* Defence *of the* Report; *only I could not but with Pleaſure take notice of the* Letters *of the* R. R. Bp. *of* Worceſter, *and the* R. Dr. Edwards, Principal *of* Jeſus Colledge, Oxon, *acknowledging the Doctrine of Chriſts Satisfaction to be ſo clearly and rightly Stated by his Lordſhip, that I judged it my Duty to apply my Self unto him, humbly beſeeching him to give his Thoughts of what I have farther to offer on this Occaſion, to which I have been encouraged by the ſignification of his Deſire, that I would give my Senſe of his* Letter, *to the End he might remove any Difficulties I apprehended to be in it. And Dr.* Edwards, *being ſo full in Aſſerting the* Truth, *and in expreſſing his juſt Indignation againſt* Antinomianiſm, *I have alſo Repreſented unto him what I think it is, that Mr. W. doth hold, and have made it my Requeſt unto him, that he will freely Impart his Sentiments on what I have deliver'd.*

I was indeed, once inclined to say something, in Answer *to some Objections: But, because the Objectors can't bear Contradiction, nor refrain from* Personal and Unjust Reflections, *I have for the present, Resolved against it. For, whatever hath been suggested by others, my entrance upon this Province hath been, and is upon a Conviction, that the way I take (notwithstanding some Brethren are of a contrary Mind) is the only way to the restoring of Union, by clearing of the Truth: That we may at least see so much of it, as to* agree in it; *or* forbear *one another about it. The Wound must be opened, before it can be Healed: The covering of it Rancles it: The smothering Matters in Silence will but keep the Fire a while under, to the breaking of it out with the greater Violence, and so much the more to the Churches Damage. But if the Advancement of Truth be sincerely our End, why may we not Consent, by a calm Discussing the Points in Difference, to search the Wound?*

It is (I am perswaded) this Method must be pursued; and Blessed be God, there is such an appearing Reason as is sufficient to strengthen our Hopes of a Happy Issue; especially, seeing my Lord Bp. *of* Worcester *has condescended to consider the Matters under Debate, which I have good Reason to believe he will do with the greatest Candor, Impartiality and Freedom, and I judge the same of the Doctor too.*

Reader, *There is but one Thing more I will add, it is to desire thee to observe, That I accuse not my* Pres-

Presbyterian *Brethren for* Socinianizing; *for what ever my fears are of* Mr. W. *and two or three more. I differ from the Learned* Leydecker *in this, and am perſwaded, that the Body of thoſe Brethren in the City go not ſo far as* Mr. Baxter. *And though I know, that thoſe Expreſſions I have taken out of* Mr. Baxter, *are according to what has been ſaid by the* Arminians, *and* Socinians *alſo, yet do I not impeach that Reverend and Learned Perſon for a* Socinian, *becauſe in ſeveral Main Points he differ'd from them: But if any one that comes after, ſhall uſe the ſame Expreſſions, there is none may blame me, if I ſay he doth* Socinianize; *much leſs when we are drawing up* Theſes *to avoid* Socinianiſm *and* Arminianiſm *(at which time we muſt be careful to have* ſuch words *put in as are repugnant unto them) may I be Cenſured, tho I expreſs my Reſentments againſt him, whoſoever he be, that is for leaving* ſuch words *out; for as I am not ſo ſure of him, as I am of* Mr. B. *who was not afraid to own what he believed, and would rather Die than Subſcribe what he, (who ſets up for his Diſciple, and un-deſired, hath placed himſelf in his Chair) hath done; ſo I am ſure, that whether he intends the favouring or introducing* Socinianiſm, *or not, it is fit to prevent the Occaſion of tempting any to that* Growing Errour, *by our Omiſſion or Neglect of that*

Quin etiam nuper Baxter. ——— *a cujus ore tota fere* Londinenſis *Civitas Pendebat,* Diſſert. Hiſtor. Theologic. *Ad de* Antinom. §. 36.

that Proviſion againſt it, which is neceſſary to be made in our Doctrinal Agreements.

But theſe Matters being referred to My Lord of Worceſter, *and to Dr.* Edwards, *I am in great Expectation of an Impartial and Juſt Deciſion, to the giving an Effectual Check to ſuch Methods as are moſt likely to advance the* Socinian Cauſe: *And therefore I will keep thee no longer from what I have Written to his Lordſhip, and the* Principal *of* Jeſus Colledge.

Feb. 15. 1698. S. L.

ERRATA.

PAge 2. Line 6. after laſt add by, p. 4. l. 31. r. near, p. 10. l. 23. r. Chriſts, p. 18. l. 29. r. us, p. 55. l. 19. dele as, p 57. l. 27. r. Prælect. p. 60. l. 18. r. *Socinian.*

Books Printed for, and Sold by Nath. Hiller *at the* Princes Arms *in* Leaden-Hall-Street *over againſt St.* Mary-Axe.

A Diſcuſſion of the Lawfulneſs of a Paſtors acting as an Officer in other Churches, beſides that which he is ſpecially called to take the overſight of. *By* the Late Reverend Mr. *Nathanael Mather.*

Pietas in Patriam; The Life of his Excellency Sir *William Phips*, Knight, Late Captain General and Governour in Chief of *New-Ergland*; containing the Memorable Changes undergone and Actions performed by him.

The Divine Inſtitution of Congregational Churches Miniſtry and Ordinances as has been profeſſed, by thoſe of that Perſuaſion aſſerted and proved by the Word of God. *By Iſaac Chauncey*, M. A.

To the Right Reverend

The Biſhop of *WORCESTER.*

My LORD,

YOUR Condeſcention to Conſider the Controverſie, between ſome Diſſenters in this City, will, I doubt not, according to your moſt Chriſtian deſire, prevent all needleſs, as well as Dangerous Controverſies amongſt thoſe, who truly own the Doctrine of *Chriſt's Satisfaction*; and contribute very much towards a Sound Determination, and a Good Agreement amongſt them. For, altho your Lordſhip hath not been ſo fully acquainted with the Matters in Difference, as could be wiſh'd; which was, I confeſs, out of your Power, and you were to Judge by what Papers you had ſeen; yet, you have, in the *Article* of *Satisfaction*, and in the Senſe given of the Controverted Phraſes, delivered what we take to be the Truth; For which, and for your *Confutation* of Dr. *Cr.* we Render you our Unfeigned Thanks, Beſeeching your Lordſhip to be as full in Expreſſing your Senſe, touching what doth as much Grieve ſome of our number in Regard to ſuch Notions as are Prejudicial to Chriſt's Satisfaction, as others are, upon an Apprehenſion of *Antinomianiſm.*

That it is not a Fondneſs for Dr. *Cr.* Notions, which lies at the Bottom of all theſe Heats, the Condemning the Propoſitions by my Brethren, will evince. And a through ſearching into the Wound being the *True Way* to a *Cure*, I will faithfully, and with the Greateſt Tenderneſs Repreſent unto your Lordſhip, what there is in the Books of Mr. *W.* that doth Diſtaſte and give ſo much Offence to ſome Brethren.

I was, I do acknowledge, a great while of Opinion, that the Differences between them, were rather about the *Way* and *Method* of Explaining the ſame *Truths*, than in the *Truths themſelves*; in which, for the *Subſtance*, I thought they had been Agreed, and declared ſo much Publickly in my *Peaceable Enquiry:* But at laſt by the Importunity of ſome very Learned and Pious Brethren, and an obſerving how Unſucceſsful other Attempts had been, I was prevailed with to Examine Mr. *W's Writings*, and did no ſooner do ſo, but I was Convinced there was too much Reaſon for the Offence my Brethren had conceived againſt 'em; which, for the ſake of the Truth, and that there may be a *Conciliation* between my Brethren, in order to their more *Unanimous* oppoſing the common Adverſary, againſt whom your Lordſhip has been ſo ſucceſsfully engaged, I will *Propoſe*, not doubting but that you will with the greateſt Impartiality ſhow, whether *there be any Juſt Grounds for our Fears*, and what is to be done for the Rectifying thoſe Miſunderſtandings that are among us.

The Great Thing then that moſtly Offends, is an Apprehenſion under a Denial of a *Change of Perſon* between Chriſt and the Believer, the Author of *Goſpel Truth ſtated* doth hold, That *Chriſt's Sufferings are not a* **Proper Puniſhment** *for our Sins*; That *they are only* **Improperly, Analogically,** and **Materially Penal**; That *our Sins are not a* **proper Meritorious** *Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings*; That *they are only an* **Occaſion**, or *Pro-cauſa meritoria*; That *they were not* **ex Obligatione legis,** or **Merito Peccati**; but **only** *ex* **Obligatione Sponſionis**; And that therefore he denies a *Change of Perſons* in that Senſe, in which it is neceſſary to explain the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

The Reaſons of this Apprehenſion I will give in its proper place, obſerving here only what I find in the Writings of the Learned Mr. *Baxter*, who, in his *Methodus*

thodus *Theologiæ*, expreſly declares, *Chriſti Perpeſſiones quoad* **rationem** *rei fuere malum* **naturale** *Perpeſſum* ex Occaſione, & Cauſalitate remota *peccatorum, generis humani.* Part 3. Cap. 1. Determ. 5. *Peccata noſtra fuêre cauſa remota Paſſionis Chriſti———Culpa noſtra non erat cauſa proxima ejus Paſſionis, ſed* **tantum** *remota,* & Occaſio.

Once more 2. *At* **ſenſu** *improprio,* per *meram Connotationem* **dici poteſt,** *Peccata noſtra* **Chriſto** *Imputata fuiſſe,* viz. *quoad reatum pœnæ* (& *culpæ ut ad pœnam,* at *non* in ſe) *idque tantum* remote: *Non quaſi peccata pœnas Chriſti* **merita** *eſſent; ſed, quia niſi nobis Pœnas merita eſſent, ille* Pœnas *non dediſſet. Et quia* pœna nulla *eſt* formaliter *niſi propter peccatum, ideo quatenus Chriſti Paſſiones fuêre Pœnæ* **Analogice** *ſic dictæ, Peccatum* (*non* ſuum *ſed* noſtrum) *non* cauſam meritoriam, *ſed quaſi* **pro-cauſam** *meritoriam,* & occaſionem) *Connotabunt Meth. Theolog. ub. ſup. Determ.* 7.

There is another *Book* of this Author, Publiſhed by a *Brother* of the *Union*, and Recommended by him to the Peruſal of young *Miniſters*, and eſpecially of all *Candidates* for the Miniſtry, with an earneſt Deſire, "they "would put on humbleneſs of Mind, and ſet themſelves at the Feet of this *Great Man*, as *Learners*, and "then through the Divine Bleſſing, he doubts not but "their Profiting will appear unto all Men. For this "*Diſputation* (he ſays) was compoſed by *him* in the "*Strength* of his *Age*, when the Oppoſition of the "*Learned* of Differing Opinions had *ſharpned* his Pen, "and made him *Critically* exact, in conſidering what "he intended for the Preſs: In this Book you have what was delivered before in *Latine* thus in *Engliſh*. "4. Man's Sin was an *Occaſion* of Chriſt's Sufferings, as "being *loco Cauſæ Meritoriæ*, for *properly* there was **no** "*Meritorious Cauſe*. 5. The Laws Curſe, or *Obligation* "was another occaſion, as being *Miſeriæ cauſa removenda*. 6. Chriſt's voluntary *Sponſion*, or *Conſent*,

" was the *Moral Obliging Cauſe*, *Univerſ. Redemp.* p. 7. " In *Page* 25. Sect. 7. We muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt ſuf- " fering *ex Obligatione legis*, & *merito Peccati*, as we " ſhould have done if we had ſuffer'd our ſelves, and " ſuffering ex *Obligatione* **ſolius ſponſionis propriæ**; " as Chriſt did without any *Merit*, or *Legal Obligation*, " his own Sponſion being *inſtead* of both, and our Sin " and Obligation being but the *Occaſion*, or *loco Cauſæ* " *meritoriæ*. In *Page* 34. The Law, as *binding* us, was " the *Great Occaſion* of Chriſt's Death, & *loco cauſæ Ob-* " *ligatoriæ*. But, not the *Obligatory Cauſe it ſelf*, " Chriſt's own *Sponſion*, and his Father's Will were the " **only** *proper Obligations*, and *p.* 8. Chriſt did not ſuffer " from the *Obligation* of the *Law*, but from the *Obliga-* " *tion* of his own *Sponſion*, on *occaſion* of the *Laws obli-* " *ging* us to ſuffer. In *p.* 91. Alſo underſtand, that " Chriſt's Sufferings had no *real*, *proper*, **meritorious** " **Cauſe**; But yet Man's Sins were the *Pro-cauſa meri-* " *toria*. He undertook to bear that Suffering, which " for them was due to us (not to him) and therefore " *where I ſay* he *bore the Sufferings due to us*, I mean it " **materialiter only**; ſuch Sufferings for kind and " weight he bore, but his *Obligation* to bare them, was " **only** from his own *Sponſion*, and not the *Law*.

My LORD,

Theſe are ſome of thoſe *Paſſages*, which move them to fear a Deſign in ſome Followers againſt the Doctrine of a **Real**, *Full*, and *Proper* Satisfaction to God's Juſtice for our Sins. For, it being **Eſſential** unto a *Proper Satisfaction*, that Chriſt's Sufferings be *truly* and *properly Pœnal*; that our Sins be the *meer* Impulſive *meritorious Cauſe* of them, and that the Obligation thereunto ariſe *ex Sanctione legis*. How can a proper Satisfaction be Aſſerted, Conſiſtently with the *Denial* of all theſe?

That

That your Lordship may see our Opposition to these Opinions, hath not hurried us to the other Extreme, I will briefly give our True Sense, which is, That when the Law was at first given *Adam*, Christ was not in its Obligation, it did not run, *Thou*, or thy *Surety for thee*: That it is not by any Act, or Designation of ours, that Christ came under the Obligation of the Law; that he was put in by his own Consent, God by his Sovereignty dispensing with his Law as to *that*, That Christ's coming into our Room and Place, his taking on him our *Guilt*, together with the whole Efficacy of his *Sufferings*, had their Rise from the *Covenant of Redemption* between the Father and the Son. For as a Learned Person well expresses it: "Man having shaken off his dependency upon God, by transgressing "the Law of Creation, God's *Rectorship* over him, "which is regulated by his *Wisdom*, **Holiness**, *Veracity*, "and the *Eternal Rectitude*, and *Righteousness of his Nature*, would not allow he should be receiv'd into favour, but in such a way, and by such means, as may "secure the Ends of Government, manifest the Displicency which is in God to sin, evidence his Truth and "Immutability in proceeding according to the *Penal Law*, which in pursuance of his own Attributes, and "Man's Rational Nature, and Relation to God, he "had at first enacted.

"And as upon the Supposition foregoing, neither "the Glory of God's Attributes had been secured, nor "his Authority over the World preserved from *Contempt*, without the *Interposure* of one every way qualified, between the Law and us, to suffer its Penalty and "make an Attonement; so in the Interposure of the Son "of God, there was the Invitation and Consent of the "Father, as well as a *Voluntary Consent* and *Undertaking* "of the Son.

But as Christ *ex propria sponsione*, and by the Will of the Father came under the Obligation of the violated

Law, ſo he ſtood bound by this Law to ſuffer for our Sins; or, as I would rather chooſe to expreſs it, that Chriſt, upon the Call, and Invitation of the Father, and his own Free Voluntary Conſent, having undertaken to be *Mediator* between God and the Offending Race of Mankind, and in that Quality to become their *Surety*, he thereupon fell under the *Sanction* of the *Law*, which we had Tranſgreſſed, and by the Obligation thereof ſtood Bound to ſuffer for our Sins in *our Stead*, whereupon our Sins became the *Meritorious Cauſe* of Chriſt's Sufferings, and his Sufferings became truly and properly *Penal*, which is (we think) meant by *Grotius*, *Voſſius*, *Eſſenius*, and others, when they affirm, that *Præter Dei*, & *Chriſti Voluntatem datur* **cauſa Antecedens** *Legitima*, *ſive* Juridica *Mortis Chriſti*; Or, to ſignifie my ſenſe in this Matter more fully if not more intelligibly. That tho God's being inclin'd to receive Faln Man, rather than the lapſed Angels, into his Mercy and Favour, have its Foundation *only* in his *Beneplacitum*, and *Will*, acting under the Influence, and Conduct of Compaſſion and Undeſerved Love of *Benevolence*; yet the ſaving us by the *Obedience*, *Death*, *Satisfaction*, and *Merit* of a *Mediator* and Redeemer, is not the effect, and reſult of God's Arbitrary Pleaſure, but is to be reſolved into the Holineſs, Wiſdom, and Righteouſneſs of his Nature, his Rectoral Authority over Creatures, capable of Moral Government, and the Sanction of his Law. So, tho the Father's Invitation and the Son's Conſent be the alone Foundation of Chriſt's Undertaking, and of the Father's Authorizing him to be Mediator; yet it is from the Obligation and Sanction of the Original Law, and not *ſolely* from his own Sponſion, that in the Exerciſe of the Mediatorial Office, he *ſuſtained our Perſon*, *bore our Sins*, and *Underwent the Curſe*, which the Law Threatned, and we had Deſerved.

My

My LORD,

We are of Opinion, that *Sufferings*, which are not from the *Obligations of a Violated Law*, cannot be an *Act* of *Rectoral Juſtice*, which doth eſſentially reſpect the *Law*, in its Diſtributions, and never inflicts Sufferings on any but for *Sin*, as their *meritorious* Cauſe. If a *Rector* ſentenceth any to Sufferings without a Regard to *Sin*, it is *unjuſt*. Whatever a *Soveraign*, in Exerting Acts of *Dominion* may do, in this Caſe, a *Rector* cannot juſtly inflict Sufferings on an Innocent Perſon, as ſuch. We do therefore agree with your Lordſhip (which my ſelf ſay *P.* 51.) when, in your *Letter*, you tell us, "That the true Controverſie between the *Socinians* and "us lies here, *viz.* Whether the Sufferings of Chriſt "were to be conſidered as *a Puniſhment for our Sins*; or "only an *Act* of *Dominion* over an Innocent Perſon, in "order to his Advancement into Glory. Not doubting but that you take Puniſhment in a *proper* ſenſe, as the Sufferings were an Act of *Juſtice*, unto which Chriſt was (as above declared) Obliged by *Vertue* of the *Sanction* of the Law; *vi*, & *merito peccati*, which could not be, unleſs our *Guilt* had been charged upon him. For *Legal Guilt*, lying in an Obligation to Puniſhment, where Puniſhment is juſtly inflicted, *Guilt* muſt be ſuppoſed as a neceſſary *Antecedent* thereunto.

But, my Lord, how can the *Legal Guilt* of our ſins be transfer'd to Chriſt, if there be not a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Believers*, *if Chriſt ſuſtained not the Perſon of Sinners*, and came not into their *Room* and *Place*, under the *Obligations* of the *ſame Law* they violated? Seeing *Guilt* lieth in an Obligation to a Proper Puniſhment, by *Vertue* of the Sanction of the Law, that this Guilt might be transfer'd upon Chriſt, it was abſolutely neceſſary, that he came under this *Obligation*, which is the thing your Lordſhip intends (as we apprehend) when you ſay. "I had thought a Mediatour

" Interposing for that End, that by his Sufferings there " might be a Propitiation for Sins, did so far *sustain* " *the Person of Sinners*, as to take upon himself the *Pu-* " *nishment* of their Sins, and procure Grace and *Favour* " *for them*: Or as a little before you have expressed it. " Legal Guilt implies, 2. An *Obligation* to undergo the " deserved Punishment; but, because the Execution of " *Punishment* depends both on the *Wisdom* and *Justice* of " the Legislator, therefore here a *Change of Persons may* " *intervene*, and by the *Wisdom* and *Justice* of God, " a Mediator may be accepted, in such a manner, as " himself **Determines**, and upon the Acceptance of " his Sacrifice, the Offenders may be Pardoned, and " Received into the Grace and Favour of God, on " such *Terms*, as he hath declared in the Gospel. And " in *this sense the* **Guilt** *of our Sins was charged upon* " **Christ** *as our Mediatour*, &c.

In these Points, so far as I understand it, we are entirely *Agreed* with your Lordship, not only in your *Assertion* of the *Truth*, but in the Renunciation of the Opposite Errours; for we Reject the Opinion of those who hold, That upon Transfering the *Guilt* of our Sins unto Christ, he is to be esteemed the *Person*, that committed all the Sins of those, for whom he died, or that the *Turpitude*, and *Filth* of our Sins was transfer'd upon him, which is a Notion equally *False*, *Blasphemous* and *Impossible*, as I have proved, both in my *Discourse of Free Grace*, and *Peaceable Enquiry*. Besides, nothing can be Renounced by us, with greater Indignation, than such *a Change* of *Persons*, as implies, that we are actually Discharged from Punishment, whilst *Unbelievers*, or *Impenitent*.

We are so very much for the Necessity of *Faith* and Repentance to an actual Discharge from *Punishment*, that tho the *Author* of *Gospel Truth*, in contradiction to what he somewhere affirms, doth in his *Defence*, p. 6. say, " That *if Christ's Righteousness could be applied for*

" *Pardon*,

" *Pardon*, to the *vileſt Sinner*, **before he believes**, it " would Juſtifie him. And *p.* 25. **That God might** " **have applied Chriſt's Merits for Pardon, tho** " **the Sinner conſented not**; Yet we are fully perſwaded, that ſuch is the *Purity* and *Holineſs* of God, as makes it impoſſible for a *Sinner* to be Pardoned, by an Application of Chriſt's Merits, whilſt he remains in *Unbelief*, or, that God, conſiſtently with the Perfections of his own Nature, might apply Chriſt's Merits to the Sinner, though he conſent not; that is, tho he remain *Unregenerate* and Impenitent: Nor, could God preſerve the Glory of his Holineſs; nor make Proviſion for the Honour of the Redeemer, ſhould he forgive Sinners *antecedently* unto, or Preclufively of Repentance and Faith, ſo that making theſe neceſſary to Juſtification and Pardon, is not ſo much to be aſcribed to the *Divine Will*, as to the *Perfections* of his Nature, the *Rectitude* of his Government, and the Indiſpenſable Regard he has to the Honour and Glory of the Redeemer. In a word, we think with the Learned Dr. *Edwards*, that to apply Pardon to a Sinner, while he continues in his Obſtinacy and Impenitence, is not only contrary to the *Holineſs* of God, but Inconſiſtent with his *Wiſdom*, and Deſtructive of his Authority and Government.

That the Divine Ordination is Neceſſary to the Acceptance of our *Faith* in Chriſt's Blood for Pardon we grant; withal Aſſerting, That the *Nature* of God and Glory of Chriſt, makes it ſo neceſſary, that it's impoſſible we ſhould be either Juſtified, or Pardoned whilſt we remain in Unbelief, and conſent not to the Terms of the *Goſpel*.

Theſe things, my Lord, I have ſtayed the longer upon, that you may ſee what little Reaſon our Brother hath to ſuggeſt, that the *Authors* of the *firſt Paper*, and *Report*, or *my ſelf*, are for a Commutation of Perſons, in the *Senſe of Dr.* Cr. *and how free we are* from *Antinomianiſm*

nomianism in the Instances alledged. Whether the Author of *Gospel Truth* stated, be as free from the *contrary Extream* in the Point of *Commutation*, and what immediately relates to a wrong stating it, assoon as I have compleated this Account I design to give of his *Coryphæus*, I will go on to consider.

It being thus cleared, that to a proper satisfaction made by the *Mediator* unto *God's* Justice for our Sins, its necessary, that his *Sufferings* be *properly Pœnal*, and that our Sins be the *nearly Impulsive*, or *truly Meritorious Cause of them*, that to this End the guilt of our Sins was laid on Christ: And that our *Legal Guilt* might be Transferred upon him, 'twas Necessary there should be a *Change of Persons between Christ and us*; that *Christ sustain our Person*, and come into our *Place* and *Stead*; These Points being, I say, cleared, it must (we think) be acknowledged, that they who deny Christ's *Sufferings* to be *Properly Penal*, and our Sins to be their *Meritorious Cause*, and do moreover expressly Declare, That Christ did not *sustain our Person*; nor any other way suffer *in our stead*, than as our Sins were the *meer Occasion*, or *Pro-causa meritoria* of his Suffering cannot consistently be for Christs making a *Real*, *Proper*, and full *Satisfaction*, And that the Learned Person, whose Place the *Author* of *Gospel Truths* stated, vainly pretends to fill, doth oppose Christ's *sustaining* the *Person* of *Sinners*, and his *suffering in our stead*, so as our Sins are the *meritorious* Cause of his Sufferings, I will essay distinctly to evince.

That he denies Christ's *sustaining*, or *suffering* in the *Person of Sinners*, is evident, from what he has in *p.* 51. of *Univ. Redemp.* "We must not say, that Christ di-
" ed *loco nostro*, so as to *Personate* us, or to *Represent*
" our *Persons* in the *Law sense*, but only to *bear* what
" else we must have born: And *p.* 74. As for their
" Objection, that no other way, but *Representing* our
" *Persons* could suffice to save us, by the *Satisfaction* of
" ano-

" another, is a groſs Miſtake, and naked Affirmation " without proof. As for them that ſay, Chriſt ſuffered " in *Perſona noſtra*, but not *ſatisfied*, or merited ſo: " I anſwer, they ſpeak Inconſiſtencies; This, and much more to this purpoſe, he has ſaid, but he being moſt Explicite in Perverting the Genuine Import of the Phraſe of [*Chriſt's Suffering*, or *Dying* **loco noſtro**, in **our Place, and Stead**] I will obſerve how he Accommodates it to the Doctrine of our Adverſaries; for ſaith he, " As I told you, that it was Eſſential to " Chriſt's *Puniſhment* in *ſpecie*, that he ſuffered *noſtro* " *loco*; ſo, becauſe *here* lies the **Firſt** and **Greateſt** " Point of the Controverſie in hand, *Quorum loco*, in " *whoſe ſtead* Chriſt Died, and whoſe *Sin* and *Guilt* did " lie upon him? And alſo becauſe the *Right* or *Wrong* " underſtanding of this Point, has ſo great Influence " into moſt of the *Conſequent Points* in the *Body of Di-* " *vinity*, as *either much to help us*, or **quite overturn** " **all**; I think it **exceeding Neceſſary**, that we here " carefully diſtinguiſh of the Phraſe, [*noſtro loco*, *in our* " *ſtead*.] Underſtand therefore, that a *thing* may be " ſaid to be done, or ſuffered, [*in our ſtead*] in theſe " **Two Senſes.**

This *Learned Perſon* having told us, that he thinks it exceeding Neceſſary, that we take more than ordinary *Care* in Diſtinguiſhing this Phraſe of [*loco noſtro*] gives but **Two** Senſes of it; the *firſt* (abating ſomewhat of his *Mode* of Expreſſion) being the only ſenſe, in which it was at firſt uſed, he leaves; and Impoſes another in Contradiction thereunto, as well as unto its Original uſe, and with his wonted *Acumen* ſets it forth, as if he had *only* been Reforming the *Abuſe* of the *Phraſe*; when, indeed, he makes it to ſignifie no more than what our Adverſaries always granted: For ſaith he, " One is ſaid " to do, and ſuffer *loco alterius*, in *another's Stead*, when " it is done to ſave another from doing it, or that ſuf- " fered which another was obliged to ſuffer toward the

" freeing

" freeing him from it. This Paſſage taken apart from the reſt of the *Paragraph*, might bear a ſound ſenſe; For ſeeing the Law *obliged* us to ſuffer a proper Puniſhment, the Aſſerting, that Chriſt came to ſuffer *that*, could (one would think) Import no leſs than that he came to ſuffer a *Proper Puniſhment* for our Deliverance. But leaſt we ſhould miſtake him, he adds: " Being " **Materially** the ſame, but not *formally* from the " *ſame Obligation*; but from the *Obligation* of a Volun- " tary Sponſion, and not being done, or ſuffered in the " *Name*, or *Repreſentation* of the *Perſon* of that other: " But in a *third Perſon*, viz. in the Perſon of a *Media-* " *tour*, *Redeemer*, or *Friend*.

Theſe Words, my Lord, will ſhow you the Rea- ſon, why the *Reporter* ſaid, " The third Paper was ſo " worded as to be Calculated to their *Meridian*, who " hold, that Chriſt ſuffer'd only in the Perſon of a Me- " *diator*, not in the *Perſon* of *Sinners*. He being aware of the Deſign of this Great Man, which is to turn [Chriſt's *Suffering* in the *Perſon of Sinners*] into [Suffer- ing in the Perſon of a *Mediatour*] who was never by Vertue of the *Sanction of the Law*, obliged to ſuffer for us, and who ſuffer'd not a proper Puniſhment, [but on- ly the ſame Sufferings we were oblig'd unto *materially* and not Formally] He being, I ſay, aware of this De- ſign, *ſuggeſted* it. But to return to my Learned Author. " We muſt alſo (ſaith he) diſtinguiſh between Chriſt's " Dying *loco noſtro*, in the *foreſaid Senſe*, and his dying " in *noſtrum Beneficium*; or between his dying for us " *ſubrogativè*, & *effectivè*: The former being the pre- " ſuppoſed ground of the latter. Chriſt is Conſidera- " ble *firſt*, as *Dying* for our *Sins* as the *Pro-cauſa merito-* " *ria*, before he is Conſiderable, as dying for our *Be-* " *nefit*. Thus he, concerning whom I muſt ſay, That tho he has put a fairer Colour upon the Repreſentation he has made of his Notions, as if they were Different from what our Adverſaries do liberally grant; yet your

Lord-

Lordſhip knows, that by declaring Chriſt's dying *noſtro loco* for our Sins, to be only as *Sin* is the *Pro-cauſa meritoria*, or (which is the ſame) the *Occaſion only*, and not properly the *Meritorious Cauſe*, it is no more than what they who Oppoſe the Truth, do conſtantly own, as your Lordſhip has obſerv'd in your Letter, when you tell us: "The *Socinians* never denied ſuch a *Change* of "*Perſon* as implies, that one is appointed, and allow-"ed to act in the behalf of others, and for their Ad-"vantage.

This, my Lord, is the Notion we do fear the *Author of Goſpel Truth ſtated*, has eſpouſed, and Labours to Advance. The Conſiderations, moving us to Entertain ſuch Apprehenſions of him, are as follow.

Conſideration I.

1. The Support and Defence of this Great Man's *Principles*, is a Province he has, *proprio marte*, undertaken and Glories in. Tho, in ſome Leſſer Matters, he may knowingly differ from him, and in other Points of Importance, he may not ſee the Connexion between one Part and another of his Scheme; and ſo fail in his Adherences, yet in the Doctrine of Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, the Agreement between them is ſo exact, and full, that I can ſee no reaſon to doubt of it. For, the Complexion of his Writings, and their Tendency, ay, the Notions upon which he values himſelf, the *Terms*, the *Phraſes* and *Arguments* which he uſes to Explain and Eſtabliſh them, are ſuch as Demonſtrate his Accord with this Great Man to be moſt entire. And whoever ſtrictly Obſerves how much more effectually Mr. *B.* before his Death did Confute and Expoſe Dr. *Criſp*'s *Antinomianiſm* than Mr. *VV* (without the greateſt Vanity can pretend unto) will ſee, that there was no need of his doing it, and that 'tis to be preſumed, his Chief Deſign,

in

in what he did was to get Countenance unto Mr. *B*'s Opinions, from those Brethren, who during his Life time, ever expressed their Dislike of 'em. Besides Mr. *B*'s Admirers understood it to be so, and on this Account Applaud him. Who then can doubt of an Exact Agreement between Mr. *B*. and him? Or think he doth not with Mr. *B*. Deny Christ's Sufferings to be *Properly Penal*, and consequently, is against such a Commutation, as is necessary to Explain the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction.

Consideration II.

2. That the bare mention of his denying a Change of Persons, in the sound sense, has put Mr. *W*. into so great a Transport of Anger, Confirms us in our Apprehension. Whilst there was nothing so particularly said of his leaving the Protestant Doctrine in this Instance, how calm was he, with what Temper and Sedateness of Mind did he write? But, on the first Intimation of his denying a Change of Persons between Christ and us. What an Alteration in his Humour and way of Writing? for he immediately thereupon diverts from the Argument, and instead of Debating the Points in Controversie, as it becomes a Disputant, he imploys his Talent in Unjust and Groundless Reflections; And really, my Lord, when I observe how little his Attempts to Destroy somewhat more than my Reputation (because of my Innocence) have moved me, I cannot but look on the great Disturbance he is under, to be an Evincement, that the Charge has touch'd him to the Quick, and his hard words are but an effort of that Vexation of Mind the Detection of his Designs has occasioned; Otherwise, why doth he not keep within the Lines of Truth and Rules of Good Breeding in those Reflections he makes on his Adversa-

ry?

ry? Why so much Art to cover his Principle, and get Reputation to his feigned Pretences? If he had really been for such a *Commutation* of Persons, as is necessary to Explain the Doctrine of Satisfaction, how easily might he Convince the most Jealous Adversary of his Soundness in this Point? Where the Difficulty in affirming with your Lordship, that our *Guilt*, as it imports an Obligation, by Vertue of the Sanction of the Divine *Law*, to undergo the Deserved Punishment, was Charged upon Christ? Or, what reason can there be for his scrupling to affirm, that our Sins are a proper Meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings, and that the Obligation Christ lay under to suffer, arose not only from the Precepts of the Mediatorial Law, and his own Consent; But, on his becoming hereby our Mediatour, it was immediately from the Sanction of the Law? But he falling in with Mr. *B.* in this Point, he could do no such thing; and therefore, we think him justly Charged with a Denial of a Change of Persons, in the sound Sense.

Consideration III.

3. This is further manifested by that Disorder and Confusion Mr. *W.* is faln into, when he Attempts to clear himself from the Charge, as is Observable from the Different *Representations* made of a *Commutation*.

My LORD,

When you speak of *such a Change* of Persons, " as " implies an Actual Translation of the *Personal Guilt* " of the Sins of Believers on Christ; and his *Personal* " Righteousness on them, without any Regard to any " Conditions on their Part, *&c.* and take *this* to be the Sense, in which Dr. *Cr.* held a Change of Persons, tho you

you uſe the word [Perſons] in the *Plural* Number, I am Perſwaded your Lordſhip hath taken Dr. *Cr.* right. And when the *Reverend Brethren* at *Little* St. *Hellen's* Declare it to be manifeſt, " That when Mr. *W.* uſeth " the Phraſe [of *no Change of Perſons between Chriſt* " and *the Elect*] it could not be intended of a Denial " of a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, in " the General Senſe, but **only** in Oppoſition to the " Opinion of his Adverſary he wrote againſt, they do not miſrepreſent Dr. *Cr.* in ſuggeſting that he holds a Change of *Perſons* Plural, in an unſound Senſe, tho their Charity miſguided them when they add, that he did only deny a *Change* of *Perſons*, in that Particular Senſe in which Dr. *Cr.* Aſſerted it; nor can I think the Reverend Rebuker out, in ſaying *p.* 43. That Dr. *Cr.* is for a Change of Perſons [Plural] tho, when he oppoſes a Change of *Perſons*, and ſets up a Change of *Perſon Singular*, he Diſſents from your Lordſhip, and the Brethren at *Little* St. *Hellens*.

However, Mr. *VV.* in his *Anſwer* to the *Report*, and in his *Haſty Animadverſions* on my Defence affirms, that he *never denied a Change of Perſons* Plural, but *only* a Change of *Perſon* Singular: His Words are *pag.* 37. " Mr. *VV.* no where ſaith there is not a Change of *Per-* " *ſons*, in the *Plural* Number, but of *Perſon* Singular, " *&c.* and *P.* 38. When Mr. *VV.* Confutes the Senſe " wherein Dr. *Cr.* Explains a *Change of Perſon*, he muſt, " in denying his Senſe, deny it under that Phraſe " (*Change of Perſon*) and *P.* 76, 77. The *Phraſe Change* " of *Perſon* was uſed by Dr. *Cr.* and therefore not in- " vented by me, it's from him, I cited it, (ſaith Mr. *VV.*) " I aſſure you I no where deny a *Change of Perſons*, in " the *Plural* Number.

Thus, my Lord, Mr. *VV.* apprehenſive of the *Difficulty* of his Caſe, and Inſufficiency of what the Brethren at *Little* St. *Hellens* have ſaid in the Third Paper for his Vindication, and that the Reverend Rebuker took

took a wrong way to defend him. He declares, that Dr. *Cr.* was only for a Change of *Perſon* in the *Singular* Number; and, that he never denied a Change of *Perſons* in the plural; ſo that here is the *Anſwerer*, and *Haſty Animadverter* Contradicting your *Lordſhip*, the *Reverend Brethren at* Little *St.* Hellens, and *the Rebuker*, as miſrepreſenting Dr. *Cr.* by ſuggeſting, that he is for a *Change of Perſons* in the *Plural Number*, and he makes the *Change of Perſon* Singular, (tho the *Rebuker* was for that) to be *Criſpian*, which he doth in ſpight of the Cleareſt Evidence; for the Account he gives of a *Change of Perſon* Singular, is only what is true of a *Change of Perſons* plural in the unſound ſenſe, thus, "A Change of "Perſon, (ſaith he) Denotes a *Change*, as to *Office*, "*Acts*, *Qualities*, *Adjuncts*, &c. really Inſeparable and "peculiar to either Chriſt on the one part, and "Men on the other, *&c.* But, my Lord, Is it poſſible there ſhould be ſuch a *Change* of *Perſon*, between Chriſt, and the Elect, that Chriſt the Saviour ſhould be the Saved, and the Elect the ſaved, become the *Saviours*, without a *Change of Perſons?* I'll not ſpeak one word of the Change of Inſeperable *Acts*, *Qualities* and *Adjuncts*, peculiar to Chriſt and the Elect, without a Change of Perſons between 'em, for I do eſteem the *Anſwer*, as publiſhed, to be only the profound Contrivance of Mr. *VV.* to Entangle and Confound the Matters Controverted, in ſuch a way as he thought moſt likely to hide his real Sentiments, about a *Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*; and what is in Truth an Evincement, that he is againſt ſuch a Change of Perſons, as is neceſſary to Explain the Doctrine of Satisfaction, how elſe comes it to paſs, that ſuch perplexing Miſts in Matters otherwiſe ſo plain and obvious, are here raiſed?

Conſideration IV.

4. That he might leave no Place for us to think he is for that Commutation which *Proteſtants* commonly Aſſert, he doth with our Adverſaries Pervert ſome Texts of Scripture, by which the Truth is ſupported.

The ſeventh of the *Hebrews*, and the 22d *Verſe* hath
p. 145 l. R been generally by *Proteſtants* Inſiſted on to prove that Jeſus Chriſt, as our *Surety*, entred into the ſame Bond with us, and that he by Vertue of the Sanction of the Law of Works was Obliged to ſuffer for our Sins; but with *Limborch*, *Curſellæus*, and *Crellius*, who oppoſe the True Doctrine of Satisfaction, he Perverts *this Text*, by making Chriſt to be a *Surety only of the Covenant of Grace*, and not in the *Law of Works*. For ſaith he, in *Man made Righteous*, p. 102. "Chriſt, *where* he is "called a Surety, was a Surety of *the better Teſtament*, "and therefore not of the Law of Works, which en- "joined Obedience and Inflicted Death on Sinners, "*Heb.* 7. 22. the word Διαθήκη is ſometimes render'd "*Teſtament*, ſometimes *Covenant*; and well it might "be render'd a Legal Diſpoſition: But call it which "you will, this *Teſtament*, or *Covenant*, of which "Chriſt is *Surety* **here**, cannot be the Covenant of "Works. It was not the *Covenant* that obliged us "to die for Sin, or perfectly obey in a way of Merit, "that *here* he is called Surety of. Is the Law of "Works that *better Covenant*, or Teſtament? Or muſt "Chriſt be a *Surety* for us, in **the Covenant of "Works**, becauſe he is *Surety* of the better Cove- "nant which is not the Covenant of Works? So *Cur- ſellæus*, *non dici*, Heb. 7. 22. *Chriſtum noſtrum Sponſorem apud Deum*; *ſed ita haberi*, **Tanto** *melioris Teſtamenti (ſeu fœderis)* ſponſor *factus eſt* Jeſus; *quod longe alium*

ſenſum

ſenſum *habet: Nimirum Deum, qui eſt novi fœderis autor*, ad *Certiores nos Reddendos, ſe fideliter executurum Promiſſa* illo *Contenta, modo a noſtrâ parte* Conditiones *ejus* ſervaremus *dediſſe nobis Jeſum Sponſorem.*——*Sed propter* Infirmitatem fidei *noſtræ, aliquo divinorum Promiſſorum opus nobis erat. Relig. Chriſt. Inſtit. lib.* 5. *c.* 19. §. 19. To the ſame Purpoſe not only *Limborch*, but *Crellius* himſelf.

But there being a Text expreſly affirming, *That Chriſt was made* under the Law *to Redeem them, that are* under the Law, *that we might receive the Adoption of* Sons, *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. He anſwers, " I might ſhow how the *Context* " doth **Confine** to the *following Senſe*, viz. *Chriſt was* " *made under* the **Jewiſh Law**, as Delivered four hun- " dred Years after the Promiſe, which could not give " Life, nor the Spirit, under *which Law* the *Jewiſh Re-* " *lievers* were ſhut up, *&c. ub ſup.* p. 110. *Crellius* in Loc. *Hoc addidit, ut eum*, non *ſolum hominem, ſed* etiam *quia ad* Judæos *ex* Legis Servitute Redimendos *mittendus* erat. Judæum genere fuiſſe doceret——Finis *miſſionis Chriſti ut* Judæos, *qui* Legi Moſaicæ *mancipati erant*, & *tum illius Maledictioni*——Obnoxii, *tum Cæremoniis Obſervandis Subjecti, ab ea* Servitute Liberaret, &c.

There is another Text, namely *Gallat.* 3. 13. which ſaith, That *Chriſt was made a* Curſe *to Redeem us from the* Curſe. And Mr. *Mather* denying the *Incarnation of the Son of God*, to be a *Part* of his *Humiliation*, Aſſerted *that all the while Chriſt was in a State of* Humiliation, *he was under the* Curſe; ſo in his *Righteouſneſs of God*, p. 7. To this Mr. *W.* reply'd *Man made Righteous*, p. 172. *this is a Point*, which *that* **Difficult** *Text*, Gal. 3. 13. *will never Prove as to the whole Time.* But why ſo **Difficult** *a Text*, in caſe he Agreed with your Lordſhip, and the generality of *Proteſtants*, in the Senſe given of it? The *Difficulty* muſt lie in the Apoſtles Affirming, that to Redeem us from the *Curſe* of the Law, Chriſt *was made a* **Curſe**; that is, Chriſt by Vertue of the

Sanction of the Law, being obliged to undergo the Wrath thereby Threatned, endured a proper Punishment for our Sins; which is so contrary to the Opinion of Mr. *W.* and doth so clearly prove what he denies, that he is forced to own it to be a *Difficulty*, which he cannot escape (he sees) but by seeming to own that the Death of Christ in the **Manner** of it is *Accursed*. So *P.* 19. "The Death of Christ in the *Manner* of it was "(saith he) *Accursed*, as well as *Shameful*. *Accursed*, because on the Cross, on the Tree, *Deut.* 21, 23. So *Cursellæus Paulus*, Citando istum *Deuteronomii* locum, *ad Explicandum* **Quomodo** *Christus pro nobis factus esset.* Maledictio, *satis indicat* Maledictionem, *quam incurrit*, in eo solum Constituisse, *quod* **Cruci** fuerit *affixus*, & **illic** *mortuus*, *Relig. Christ. Instit.* lib. 5. c. 19. Sect. 20.

Thus, my Lord, you see, how Mr. *W.* Joyns with the Common Adversary, in Perverting these *Texts*, and therefore Justly esteemed to Agree with them in what they hold about the Nature of *Christ's Satisfaction*, which makes it evident, that he doth also, with them, deny such a Commutation as is necessary to Explain this Doctrine, as held by *Protestants*.

Consideration V.

5. The *Commutation of Persons* between Christ and us, which he is for, as it is less, much less than what Dr. *Cr.* is for, so it's no more than what our Adversaries on the other Extreme will grant; for, if I guess right, they'll be for any Commutation, or Change of Persons, if short of what is *necessary to Christ suffering a Proper Punishment for our Sins*; or short of our Sins being the *Meritorious* Cause of *Christ's Sufferings*. That Commutation which is necessary to this much, is, I apprehend the only *Medium* between the *Socinian* and *Antinomian Extremes*, as set down by your Lordship: But *such*

such a Commutation there cannot be, unleſs Chriſt *ſuſtained* the *Perſon of Sinners*, ſo *far*, as to be juſtly Charged with the Guilt of their Sins, in the Senſe you have given of it.

My LORD,

You know, that when we ſpeak of *Chriſt*, as ſuffering *for us*, we do not here take the *Perſon*, we ſpeak of, *Abſtractly*, as *Innocent*, for then there is no Queſtion, but that the *Puniſhment* of one, as *ſuch*, is *unjuſt*. But, we Conſider him, as one ſo *ſubſtituted* into our *Place*, and *Stead*, as that the *Guilt* of our Sins is Tranſlated unto him, and he juſtly charged with it. He is not only *dealt with as a Sinner*, but with reſpect to *him*, who Inflicted the Puniſhment, there was the Conſideration of *Sin* as the *Reaſon* and *Cauſe* of it; Whereas, if Chriſt be looked on as *Abſtract*, from the Conſideration of his *ſuſtaining our Perſon*, how can we eſteem him Guilty, unleſs he had been *Perſonally ſo*; than which nothing is more Blaſphemouſly Abſurd. Beſides, if Chriſt did not at all Suſtain our *Perſon*, how could he ſuffer in *it*? Or, how could it be truly ſaid, that *we ſuffered in Chriſt*, and ſeeing Sufferings are *Eſſential* to *Puniſhment*, if we *ſuffer'd* not in Chriſt, how could we be properly ſaid to be *Puniſhed* in him? But, your Lordſhip has well obſerv'd, from the Conceſſions of our Adverſaries; "that "tho they will not grant, that Chriſt was *Properly Puniſhed* for us; yet, they cannot deny, but that we "may very *Properly* be ſaid to be *Puniſhed* in Chriſt for "our *Sins*. *Diſc. of Chriſt's Suffer.* Cap. 3. Sect. 2.

But, my Lord, how clear ſoever theſe things are, yet the *Author of Goſpel Truth ſtated*; in his *Man made Righteous*, p. 58. doth nevertheleſs declare, "That *Chriſt did not* Anſwer *the* Demands *of* Juſtice, in **our Perſon**, Pag. 98, &c. Denying Chriſt and us to be in *Conſectu fori*, or (to uſe his own Phraſe) in *Law Senſe* **One**; and will not allow ſo much as what the *Moderate* and

Judicious Bishop *Reynolds* on *Psal.* 110 4. doth Assert, where he saith, " That Christ had the Guilt of Sin up-" on him so far as it notes an *Obligation* to Punishment, " as he was *our Surety*; and so *in sensu Forensi*, in the " Sight of God's Court of *Justice* One with us——He " and they in *Conspectu Fori* being as but one Person. " But Mr. *W.* tells us, That *One Person, in Law*, made " up of *Christ and us* alike obeyed in *Law-sense*, and " then **One Person in Law**; made up of him, and " us alike Rewarded, *p.* 58. And in his Printed Letter to Mr. *Humfrey's*, as he doth contrary to the Convictions of his own Conscience, represent me to be a Pleader for Dr. *Cr's Change of Persons*, so he delivers himself thus. " It's worth Mr. *Lobb's* Leasure to consi-" der how he lays such a stress on a *Change of Persons*, " in *Cr's* Sense? How could Christ and we be One Per-" son *in Law*, and yet Christ's Person and our Person " be mutually changed, unless that both Persons were " changed into a *Tertium Quid?* And whereas Mr. *Mather*, in his Sermon of the *Righteousness of God*, p. 14. had said, " That the Ground and Reason of Christ's " Suffering under the *Curse* of the *Law*, is, because " our *Guilt*, our *Sins* were *laid upon him*, and thence he " suffer'd in *our stead* for *them*. Mr. *W.* made this Reply, *Man made Righteous*, p 174. *viz.* " *Our Guilt, our* " *Sins were upon him.* **Crispian Phrases,** *which for* " *some End or other* he *likes to Conserate.* But how can he esteem these Phrases, *viz. Our Guilt* or *our Sins* being on Christ to be *Crispian*, if he holds such a Commutation of Persons between Christ and us, as implies, that Christ was so *Substituted* into our room and place, as to be charged with the Guilt of our Sins?

Besides, in his *Man made Righteous*, he will not admit, that we suffered, or were Punished in Christ, because then, he thinks, it must be granted, that we *satisfied* in Christ, and were our own Redeemers; whereas it's manifest, that the *Satisfaction* doth not arise from our

our *Suffering* in Christ, nor indeed from Christ's Sufferings considered Absolutely, and *in se*, but from the Father's *Acceptation* of the Son's Sufferings, as they were *ex obligatione Legis*, and *Equivalent* to the Demerit of our Sin. But Mr. *W.* here speaking the same things with Mr. *B*, we cannot in reason suppose a Difference between them in the Point of a *Commutation of Persons*, and therefore must conclude, the true Reason, why Mr. *W.* denies, That Christ and we are *One Person* in *Law sense*; That he suffered *in our Person*: That we were Punished in Christ, *&c.* to be, because he is against *such* a *Commutation* of *Persons*, as is necessary to *Explain* Christ's Satisfaction.

Consideration VI.

6. That Mr. *W.* denies such a Commutation, as is necessary to Christ's suffering a *Proper* Punishment for our Sins, is further evinced, by his being so Express, that the *Obligation* Christ lay under to suffer, is not from the *Sanction* of the Law of Works; but, from the *Precept* of the Law of *Mediation*.

In his *Man made Righteous*, p. 11, 12, and p. 20, *&c.* He affirms. that *the* Obligation, *Christ* lay *under* to *suffer*, *Arose* only from the *Mediatorial* Command, and his own Consent, and that he may the more Plausibly Insinuate this Notion, his Labour is to prove the Incarnation of the Son of God (to which he could not be *Obliged* any otherwise than *ex sponsione* by the Father's Will and his own *Consent*) to be a *Part* of his *Humiliation*. Whence it is, that except he uses the word [*Humiliation*] in a double sense, as *Socinus* doth the Word [*Curse*] he must hold, that Christ's *Sufferings* are not *Properly Penal*, for the Incarnation, not being by Vertue of the Sanction of the Law, it cannot fall within the Compass of a Proper Punishment. And, I presume,

he won't say, that the Son of God assumed our Nature by Vertue of the *Sanction*, especially, seeing he saith, *p.* 62. " A *Penal* Sanction, in case of Christ's Failure, " had no room in the *Law of Mediation*, because of the " Impossibility of his Non-Performance, and seeing a *Penal Sanction* never takes Place on any, but upon the Account of a Failure of Obedience to the Precepts of a Law, to which it was annexed, the *Incarnation* cannot be by Vertue of a Penal Sanction, in this Law, and surely he'll not say, it is from the *Penal* Sanction of the *Law of Works*, therefore from no Penal Sanction, and not Properly Penal; And seeing he has neither Distributed Christ's Humiliation into what is *meerly* Afflictive, and *Properly Penal*; nor given any reason for our doing so, we must suppose, that he looks on Christ's *Humiliation* to be all of a Piece, and no otherwise *Penal* then *Improperly*, *Analogically*, and *Materially* so, as this Part of Christ's *Humiliation* was.

In this Opinion of Mr. *W.* I am confirm'd by what he delivers, *p.* 111, 112. " It was not from **any** Ob- " ligation the Law of Works had upon him, that he " became *Obliged to be a* **Subject**; or, if **he became** " **a Subject**, that he **must Die, whilst he was an** " **Innocent Person**; where, by the Words [*whilst Innocent*] I suppose he means, whilst he Abstain'd *from transgressing* the Law, whilst he remain'd Holy, Harmless and Undefil'd; which being to the last, he could never be Obliged to Die by Vertue of this Penal Sanction.

Besides, what he so largely insists on, in his struggles, to prove that Christ was not our Money Surety in the *Law of Works*, Centers in this, That his Obligation to suffer, did not arise from the Sanction of the Law, and his Addition of [*as a Pecuniary Surety*] is Design'd chiefly to cover his Notion, and by casting Reproach on his Orthodox Opposers, to drive his Unthinking Readers from the *Truth*, and Dispose 'em to a more Ready Em-

bracing

bracing his own Notions. In *p.* 92. " The Thing " which I deny (saith he) is, that Christ by his *Obedi-* " *ence* made Attonement, or Merited for us, as a *Pro-* " *per Pecuniary Surety* in the *Law of Works*. The Thing " is quite otherwise, for Christ **Suffer'd**, and Obeyed, " as a *Principal* and **Sole** *Undertaker*, & not as a *Surety*, " that supposed us Principals, in that Undertaking. He " *bound* himself to God to give his Life by Dying *in* " *our Stead*, to save ours; but he was never bound in " *One Bond* with us, that he should do so. I shall give " you a few Reasons of many.

My LORD,

What can these words [Christ was, **never, never** Bound in *One Bond* with us, to Die, or Suffer] signifie less than that as he was not *Originally* under the Bonds and Obligations of the Law of Works; so he never was *ex Sponsione*; As much, as if it had been said, Christ's Sufferings were not *ex Obligatione Legis*, his Obligation to suffer, was not by Vertue of the Sanction of the Law.

To strengthen this Consideration, it is but to Represent unto your Lordship, what he has in his *Hasty Animadversions* on my *Defence*, *p.* 89. where he assures me, he cannot think, that *Christ's Obligations* to suffer the Punishment of our Sins, did *immediately* result from the *Law*: Whereas your Lordship knows, that tho' Christ came not under the Obligation of the *Law of Works*, but by the Father's Will, and his own Consent, as Agreed unto, in the *Covenant of Redemption*; yet, on his Entring into the Office of a Mediatour, the Obligation to suffer for Sin, is immediately by *Vertue* of the *Sanction* of the *Law*. If then, Christ's *Obligation* to Sufferings did not Result from this Law, our Sins were not the Impulsive Cause of his Sufferings; or if it did not *Immediately*, our Sins were but the *Remote* Cause, or Occasion, not a near Impulsive, or Proper Meritorious Cause

Cauſe of them, which is as much as to Affirm, Chriſt's Sufferings tho *Improperly*, *Analogically*, and *Materially*, yet not *Properly*, and *Formally Penal*, and that therefore Mr. *W.* is againſt *ſuch a* Commutation of Perſons as is neceſſary to Explain *Chriſt's* Satisfaction.

My LORD,

The Force of this Argument doth, I count, lie in this, that the *Obligation* to a Proper Puniſhment, muſt be by *Vertue* of the *Sanction* of the *Divine Law*; That Mr. *W.* is poſitive, the Obligation, which *Chriſt* lay under to ſuffer, was not from the Law of Works; nor from a Penal Sanction of the Mediatorial Law, for it has none, but from the *Precept* of that Law, and his own Conſent, for which reaſon, I am induced to Conclude, that he Denies *Chriſt's* Sufferings to be Properly Penal, and conſonantly hereunto, he cannot be for ſuch a Commutation of Perſons as is neceſſary to Explain *Chriſt's* Satisfaction; and of this Opinion I ſhall be, 'till he ſhews us by *Vertue of what Sanction Chriſt was Obliged to Suffer.*

My LORD,

Theſe Conſiderations ſet together in conjunction with the *Burden* of his *Man made Righteous*, which was publiſhed ſince the *Agreement Decemb.* 92. ſeems to us, to be of force, and ſufficient to Juſtifie our Fears, that ſuch a Commutation is denied by Mr. *W.* as is neceſſary to Explain *Chriſt's* Satisfaction.

But it's urged againſt us, That he owns *Chriſt's Sufferings* to be *Penal*; and that they were *in our place and ſtead*, as well as *for our Good*. To which I Anſwer,

1. Your Lordſhip has obſerv'd, that *Crellius* has in Appearance made conſiderable Approaches towards us, and nevertheleſs very far from owning the Truth. That "Their Conceſſions in *Terms* are ſometimes ſo "fair,

fair, as tho the Difference were meerly about *Words*, without any conſiderable Difference in the *Thing* it ſelf: If we charge them with denying Satisfaction, *Crellius* Anſwers in the Name of them, *that we do it unjuſtly*, for they do *Acknowledge a Satisfaction worthy of God*, and *agreeable* to the *Scriptures*. If we charge them with denying that *our Salvation is obtained by the Death of Chriſt*, they aſſert the contrary; as appears by the ſame *Author*. Nay, *Ruarus* Attributes **Merit to the Death of Chriſt** too. They Acknowledge that *Chriſt died for us*; nay, that there was a *Commutation between Chriſt and us, both of One Perſon for another*, and of *a Price for a Perſon*; and that the *Death* of *Chriſt* might be ſaid to move God to *Redeem* us; they Acknowledge *Reconciliation*, and **Expiation** of *Sins* to *be by the Death of Chriſt*. Nay, they Aſſert, *That Chriſt's Death was by reaſon of our Sins*, and *that God deſigned by that to ſhew his Severity againſt Sin*. And what could we deſire more, if they meant the ſame thing by theſe words which we do? *Suf. of Chr. cap.* 2. *Sect.* 1. And what has Mr. *VV.* ſaid more? Doth Mr. *VV.* ſay, that *Chriſt* bore the puniſhment of our Sins? *Crellius* ſays the ſame, only with this Explication, *viz.* that it muſt be taken *Materially* and *Improperly* which is the ſenſe, in which Mr. *B.* and conſequently Mr. *VV.* take it? Or, what elſe doth Mr. *VV.* touching the *Nature* of *Satisfaction* affirm, that *Crellius* doth not grant? They ſay, indeed that Mr. *VV.* holds *Chriſt's Sufferings* to be not *only for our Good and Benefit*, but alſo to be in *our place* and *ſtead*, a point which *Crellius* would never Acknowledge. To which I Anſwer.

2. The true Reaſon, why *Crellius* would not allow of *Chriſt's* ſuffering to be [*noſtro loco*, or *vice noſtra*, in *our place* and *ſtead*] was, becauſe theſe *Phraſes* did, in his judgment, ſignifie the ſame thing with ſuch a *Surrogation*, as Imports, that *Chriſt* was put into our *State* and

Place

Place to ſuffer the very *Puniſhment* we had Deſerved by our *Sins*, which could not be unleſs he came under the *Obligation of the Law* we had tranſgreſſed: Nay, he runs it further, Affirming, that *Chriſt's* ſuffering *vice noſtra* doth ſignifie that the *Sufferings* muſt be the *ſame* with ours in *every Reſpect*, and conſequently *Eternal*, and that our *Deliverance* muſt immediately, even *ipſo facto*, follow thereupon.

Thus *Crellius* having ſpoken of a Proper Surrogation, adds, *Hoc ipſum ſignificari* ſolet cum *quis* **vice,** *vel* **Loco** *alterius quicquam dicitur perpeſſus*——*Nam id quod nos Pati* **merebamur;** *erat mors* Eterna, *&c.* More particularly he underſtood theſe Phraſes [ſuffering *Vice noſtra*, *Loco noſtro*] as Importing the ſame with *Nomine noſtro*, and in a ſenſe neceſſary to their being properly Penal. For (ſaith he) *Si Chriſtus ob Peccata noſtra* punitus *fuit a Deo*, *neceſſe eſt eum* **noſtro Nomine,** *ſeu* **noſtro Loco,** *ac* **Vice Pœnam** *illam perpendiſſe*, ut *quidem cum cæteris omnibus*, *qui iſtam Chriſti* **Satisfactionem** *defendunt*, *contendit* Grotius, *& reſipſa cogit. Et enim*, *vel ſuo* Nomine, *eam pœnam pependit Chriſtus*, vel *noſtræ. Non* **ſuo,** *cum fuit* **Innocentiſſimus,** *&* is qui Pœnam Exegiſſe *Statuitur* Juſtiſſimus. *Reſponſ. ad Grot. cap. 9. Part 1. cap. 4. Part. 2.*

As theſe *Phraſes* denote, that Chriſt's Sufferings were *ex Obligatione Legis*, and properly penal, that our Sins were their *Meritorious Cauſe*; ſo it was, that *Crellius* oppoſed them, ſo that if Mr. *VV.* denies our Sins to be the *Meritorious Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings*, or Chriſt's Sufferings to be *ex Obligatione Legis*, and properly penal, tho he is for the *Phraſes* which *Crellius* Rejects, he owns no more than *Crellius* doth, as to the Thing it ſelf.

To clear this, it's ſufficient to obſerve.

1. That tho Mr. *B.* whoſe *Notions* are the Rule by which we muſt Judge of Mr. *VV.* in the preſent Caſe, doth Diſtinguiſh Chriſt's dying *in our place* and *ſtead*, from his *dying* for *our Benefit* and *Advantage*, Affirming Chriſt's

Christ's Suffering in *our stead* to be the presupposed Ground of his Suffering for our *Good*; yet, when he explains himself, the whole he saith on this occasion, signifieth no more than that Christ suffered for our Sins, as the *Pro-causa Meritoria*, or as our *Sins were* the *Occasion*, not *proper Meritorious cause of* his Sufferings; which *Crellius* has oft readily granted.

2. It's impossible for Mr. *VV.* in Consistance with his *Man made Righteous*, to hold, that Christ suffered in *our place* and *stead*, in the common sense of *Protestants*. For there he is so vehement in denying Christ's Sufferings to be by *Vertue of the Sanction of the Law*, and so full in asserting, that the *Obligation* Christ lay under to *suffer*, arose only from the *Precept* of the *Mediatorial* Law, that he cannot hold Christ's Sufferings to be in our *place* and *stead* any otherwise than as it signifieth no more than for our *Benefit* and *Advantage*.

By Christ's suffering in *our place* and *stead* (as I apprehend) its meant, that whereas we were by Vertue of the Sanction of the Law of Works obliged to a *proper Punishment*, Christ freely came into this *Place*, and by Vertue of this Sanction, suffered what we Deserv'd. If then *Christ's* Sufferings were not *ex Obligatione Legis*, but only *ex Obligatione Sponsionis*, by Vertue of a Precept of the Law of Mediation, he never came into our place; he never suffered in our *stead*, as these phrases signifie somewhat more than for *our Good*.

Sufferings properly penal must be by Vertue of the *Sanction of a Law*, (as the Sufferings are to which we stand obliged) and that *Christ* might suffer *Penally*, 'twas necessary he be substituted into our place and room, that is, to be so under the *Law of VVorks*, that his *Obligation* to suffer be *immediately* by Vertue of the Sanction. But this Mr. *VV.* denies, declaring that *Christ's* Obligation to suffer was only by Vertue of the Mediatorial Law. How then could he be substituted into our place? We were under the Obligation of the *Law of VVorks*, but

Christ

Christ was never there: He was under the Obligation of the *Mediatorial* Law, and there we never were. And surely Mr. *W.* wont say, That Christ was under the Obligation of the Law of Grace, as Distinguish'd from the *Law* of Mediation; What place then were we in, for Christ to come into it?

'Tis true, he saith, that the *Essentials* of the *Law of Works* were taken into the *Mediatorial Law*, but then he over and over has it, that Christ lay under no *Obligation* to obey either *Actively* or *Passively* any otherwise than by *Vertue* of the Precepts of this Law. So *P.* 62. "Christ's Active and Passive Obedience became *Formally* a *Compleat Righteousness*, as what he did and suf-"fer'd was an exact *fulfilling* of the *Conditions* of the "Reward in the Sanction, [that is of the Covenant of Redemption.] And *p.* 12. From this Covenant [to wit the *Law of Mediation*] ariseth the *Immediate Obligation* of Christ, in *all his Obedience*, [a part of which, he *makes his Sufferings*] as well as the Rule and Measure of it.

Thus, my Lord, it seems very plain to me, that he cannot, upon the Foundation he has laid, hold that Christ suffer'd *in our stead*, or *endured* the Punishment of our Sins in any other sense than that in which Mr. B. has Explained it; which is, that our Sins were the Occasion, or *Pro-causa meritoria* of Christ's Sufferings, and Christ's Sufferings only *Improperly*, **Materially** and *Analogically* penal; for, as to the Obedience and Sufferings, which the Law of Works enjoyned, the *matter* of 'em only is taken into the *Law of Mediation*, and they become *Formally* a Righteousness, by their Conformity to the Mediatorial Commandments.

My LORD,

Mr. *W.* I confess, aims at a Notion which our Adversaries, who wanting neither Learning nor Courage, have clearly stated, but for some Reasons obvious to them,

them, who know him best, he is, in what he Delivers, very *Obscure* and *Perplex'd*; for, whilst he is barefac'd enough, in affirming, That *Christ's Sufferings*, which, for their *Matter*, fell under the *Law of Works*, became Obligatory unto him only by the Precept of the Law of Mediation, he doth not only labour to conceal his *Opinions* about a *Commutation*, and how *Christ's Sufferings* are in *our stead*; and in *what sense* they *are Penal*, &c. but he doth also *confound* the *Law of VVorks* with the *Mediatorial Law*, in his Arguings, as if his Opposers held, that Christ was *Constituted Mediatour* by the *Law of VVorks*, and in Contradiction unto them, he Advances such a Notion of *Imputed Righteousness*, as is *New*, Different from, and Subversive of the *Protestant Faith*; for, according to him, it is a *Righteousness* which lieth not in Conformity either to the *Law of VVorks*, or *Law of Grace*.

The Controversie about *Imputed Righteousness*, as it hath been Agitated between *Protestants* and some others, is, Whether it be a Righteousness, that Answers the Obligation of the *Law* of *VVorks*; or of the Law of *Grace?* The *Protestants* generally Affirming, That it Answers the *Law of VVorks* and some others, the *Law of Grace*, and that it was *Faith it self* the Act of Believing, that was *Imputed* and counted for Righteousness. But Mr. *VV.* is positive, That *Imputed Righteousness* is a Righteousness distinct from both these, even a Righteousness answering the *Obligations* of the *Law* of *Mediation*.

My LORD,

Mr. *VV.* Asserts, That it is Christ's Righteousness that is Imputed; that Christ was never under the Bonds or Obligation of the Law of Works; that he was only by his own Consent under the *Law* of Mediation; and that it is the *Mediatorial Righteousness* of Christ, that is Imputed. Yea further, That the *Effects* of this Righteousness

teouſneſs are not only made ours; But beſides theſe, the *very Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* is Imputed to true Believers, which is as much as if it had been ſaid, Chriſt's *Mediatorial Righteouſneſs, in ſe*, is Imputed to 'em, whence it is, that he freely grants, we are not Juſtified either by a Righteouſneſs anſwering the Obligations of the Law of Works, or of the Law of Grace, becauſe it is by the *Mediatorial Righteouſneſs*.

Now this Mediatorial Righteouſneſs being of a very large and comprehenſive Extent, doth not only include the Matter of that Righteouſneſs enjoyned by the Law of Works, but the *Incarnation* of the Son of God; and all that Chriſt did as *Mediatour*, this whole Righteouſneſs is by Imputation made their Righteouſneſs, which is indeed to make us more Righteous than Mr. *Mather*, (who confin'd it to his anſwering the Obligation of the Law of Works) has done; and how he can Affirm that Chriſt's Mediatorial Righteouſneſs *it ſelf* is Imputed to us, without making us Mediators, I cannot, according to his way of Reaſoning, comprehend.

My LORD,

Mr. *VV.* ſaith, That Chriſt ſuffered in *our* ſtead; and when he ſaith thus much, his true meaning is, that Chriſt's Sufferings, as an *Act of Obedience* to the Mediatorial Law, is in our ſtead; and if ſo, all his Mediatorial *Obedience* muſt be in our ſtead too: For (ſaith he) *Man made Righteous*, p. 22. "If Chriſt's Sufferings were "a part of his Obedience, then we were made Righ- "teous thereby, or we are made Righteous only by "ſome part of his Obedience, which, I ſuppoſe, you'll "not affirm. Theſe are Mr. *VV.* his own Words; and why doth he ſuppoſe, that we will not Affirm, that we are made Righteous by a part of Chriſt's Obedience, but becauſe he is under the fulleſt Perſwaſion, that every part of Chriſt's Obedience, whether *Active* or *Paſſive*, is Mediatorial, and of ſuch a Nature, that what is truly

ſaid

ſaid of one part, is true of every part; and as he elſe-where ſaith, "His Sufferings were both Satisfactory and "Meritorious, and his Active Obedience Meritorious "and Satisfactory, p. 35. whence I infer (and I think with good reaſon) that the whole of Chriſt's Mediatorial Righteouſneſs was (according unto him) as much in *our ſtead*, as any one part of it, *viz.* The Son of God's Aſſuming our Nature, his gathering in the Elect, and raiſing them to Glory, is all done in our *place* and *ſtead*: But, in what ſenſe can he hold, that theſe things are done by Chriſt in *our ſtead*? In none, undoubtedly, unleſs he means no more by *it*, than is imported by that other Phraſe, [*For our Good.*]

That the Son of God's aſſuming Humane Nature; his gathering in the Elect; begetting a Seed, giving them Grace; delivering them from all their Enemies; and at laſt raiſing them to Glory, are Parts of Chriſt's Mediatorial Righteouſneſs, and for our Utility and Profit, we believe: But we can't think the Son of God did *ſtand* in *our ſtead*, to do theſe things for us. We were never Obliged to theſe Mediatorial Acts, and therefore Chriſt by coming under the Obligation to do them, came not into *our Place*, to do them in *our ſtead*. And, ſeeing he is of Opinion, that Chriſt's Sufferings in this Tranſaction are to be conſidered only as Mediatorial Acts, how can he hold them to be in *our ſtead* any otherwiſe than his other Mediatorial Acts are, ſome of which he muſt acknowledge, were only *for our Good*.

My LORD,

Before I diſmiſs this Point, 'twill be (I humbly apprehend) neceſſary, that I repreſent unto you as clearly as I can, the *Subſtance* of his Notion, in this particular, not doubting but that 'twill greatly contribute towards the more full taking in the true Deſigns of its Author; and to this end I will go back ſo far as his *ſeventh Propoſition*

ſition, p. 13. which is. " *Prop.* 7. **Satisfaction** being " to be made for the innumerable Sins committed, and " not only Forfeited Bleſſings but even *Greater* to be " merited, and that for *many*; the *Obedience of Chriſt* " muſt **Exceed** what **the Law of Works** In- " **joyned** Mankind as the **Condition** of **it's Re-** " **ward.**

In his Explications, he ſheweth *how far*, and upon *what reaſon*, Chriſt's Satisfactory and Meritorious Righteouſneſs *Exceeds* what the Law of Works Injoyned. And in *p.* 62. " This Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as the " **Perfoꝛmed Condition** of the Reward, was a *Fœderal Righteouſneſs*, **above what was to be Man's** " **Righteouſneſs** by the *Law* of **Woꝛks**, which " could not be, but that the *Conditions* conſented to by " Chriſt in the *Covenant of Redemption were other*, and " **Greater** *than what were* required of *Adam* by the " Covenant of **Woꝛks.**

In *P.* 64. " If you ask why Chriſt's Righteouſneſs " muſt *thus* **Exceed** what the *Law of Works* Ordained? " I anſwer: It's more to purchaſe **Greater Bleſſings** " for *one* that has forfeited all Good, than to *continue* " *leſſer* Bleſſings, tho with ſome Addition to one that " has not forfeited. So far Mr. *W.*

Whence I obſerve, That according to his Aſſertions, the *Reward* Believers have a *Right* unto, by *Vertue* of *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is much greater than could be *merited* by a *Righteouſneſs* anſwering the **Law** *of Works*; and the Righteouſneſs by which the Reward is merited, is much above what this Law required, it lying in the *Performance* of the Conditions enjoyned by the Law of Redemption, which (he ſays) is Imputed to us for our *Juſtification*. So *P.* 75. " Chriſtians become thus *Righ-* " *teous* upon believing, by the **Righteouſneſs of** " **Chriſt Imputed to them,** in their Juſtification; " and by the continuance of this *Imputation*, they re- " main **Righteous**——Then he adds, " I will ex-

" plain

" plain this Great Truth of Juſtification by the *Impu-*
" *ted Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.*

" 1. There is a making us *Righteous*, as it is a giving
" a Believer a **Right** to *Pardon*, *Abſolution from the*
" *Curſe*, *Adoption* and *Acceptance*, which is by Impu-
" ting the Righteouſneſs of *Chriſt* to the Believer.
" ——*Chriſt*'s Righteouſneſs may be conſidered,

" 1. As a *full* **Performance** *of the* Conditions *of*
" *the* Covenant of Redemption, which included a
" **full** Conformity to the Law of Works; yea, **and**
" **more.**

" 2. An *Adjudged Right* to the Promiſed *Reward* for
" his Performance of **thoſe** Conditions, now both
" theſe are *Imputed* to the *Believer*, in this firſt Conſi-
" deration of *Giving a* **Right** to Pardon, *&c.*

Here is, my Lord, an *Imputation* of a twofold Righ-teouſneſs for our Juſtification, neither of which, as ſuch, belong to the Law of Works, or to the Law of Grace.

The *firſt* lieth in a Performance of **all** Required of *Chriſt* by the Preceptive part of the Mediatorial Law.

The *ſecond* is an *Adjudged Right* to the Promiſed Re-ward; which, as it Reſults therefrom, ſo it Includes in it more, *much more* than was comprehended in the *Re-ward* Promiſed in the Law of Works.

And anſwerable hereunto, there is a twofold **Impu-tation.**

The *firſt* `*Mediate*, which is of that Righteouſneſs which lieth in the Performance of the Conditions of our Salvation.

The *ſecond* is **Chriſt's Adjudged Right** to his Seeds Pardon, Abſolution from the Law Curſe, Acceptance and Adoption, which is **immediately Imputed** to Believers, as his *Regenerate Seed* and *Members of his Myſtical Body*. This Right is eſteemed, yea made *theirs* (ſays he) they have not meerly the *Benefits* given them, but they are Inveſted in **Chriſt's Right** to theſe Be-

nefits: Believers are not only *Pardoned*, nor have they only a *Right* to Pardon, by promiſe of a Pardon, but they have **Chriſt's Right** to that Pardon, even **His Adjudged Right**, that Believers ſhall be pardoned: Conſequent upon his *Right to Pardon*, God *actually* forgives, Adopts and gives the **Earneſt** of Glory to Believers **thus Inveſted** in the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*.

To ſum up his Notion; The Believer, who at laſt is Actually pardoned, hath *firſt* a **Right** *to Pardon*; for as Chriſt's *full Performance of the Conditions* of the Covenant of Redemption, or Mediatorial Law is a Righteouſneſs **Mediately** Imputed to Believers for their **Right** to Pardon; ſo there is another *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, even his **Adjudged Right** to the *Reward*, which is *immediately Imputed* to them, whereby they have a Right, yea Chriſt's Right to pardon. So that it's now apparent, that Mr. *W.* holds,

1. That Juſtification doth not in its primary Conſideration, Include the Pardon of Sin, but only a Right *thereunto*; as if we might believe, and not be thereupon *Actually* pardoned, *p.* 76, 78.

2. That the *Righteouſneſs of* Chriſt, by which we are Juſtified, is not a Righteouſneſs *formally* anſwering the *Obligation* of the Law of Works, or of the Law of Grace, but only of the *Mediatorial Law*. It lieth in the **Full** *Performance* of the Conditions of the Covenant of Redemption, or in an entire Conformity to the *Mediatorial* Law, and Chriſt's Adjudged Right unto the promiſed Reward annexed thereunto. It is the *Mediatorial Righteouſneſs*, which is Imputed unto us. But,

My LORD,

Whether his Aſſerting, that *Juſtification* primarily doth Include in it the Believer's Right; yea Chriſt's **Adjudged Right** to Pardon and Adoption, *&c.* and that

that Christ's *Imputed Righteousness* for Justification lieth in a *full Performance* of the Conditions of the Covenant of Redemption, and in Christ's *Adjudged Right* to the Reward, be the common Doctrine of *Protestants* ? I humbly submit to your Lordship's Consideration. But whether it be or not, I add.

3. That his making Christ's Righteousness both *Active* and *Passive*, *Satisfactory* and *Meritorious* to lye *formally* in *Answering the Obligation* of the *Precepts of the* Mediatorial Law, doth sufficiently instruct us, that he must deny Christ's Sufferings, or Obedience to be in our *place* and *stead*, in the sound sense, and that therefore they cannot be a proper Satisfaction, or Merit for us in what Christ did and Suffered, as professed by *Protestants*.

Had he not fancied he had hit on a Notion to introduce this whole Scheme in a more easie way than his Learned *Coryphæus* thought on, he would have Adhered as firmly to him, in the Point of *Justification*, as he had done in that other of *Satisfaction* ; but daring more than he, because he saw not so much, whilst he owns the same Notion, he has thus Involv'd himself in this *finer Explication* ; And, in the Upshot must either Abandon his *Coryphæus*, in the Doctrine of *Imputed Righteousness*, or own that 'tis *Imputed only in its Effects*.

To return. By these few Intimations in Connexion with what has been urged in my *Defence of the Report*, about a *Rejecting the several Phrases*, commonly used by *Protestants* to express the Truth in the Controverted Points, and the *Reasons* assigned for the doing so, your Lordship will see, that the Offence arose from an Apprehension, that the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction is Oppugned ; and that Mr. *Williams* doth hold, That Christ did not so far *sustain* the *Person* of *Sinners*, as to *take upon* him a proper Punishment, and that he is against

ſuch a Commutation of Perſons as is neceſſary to Explain the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

My LORD,

We are not fond of the Controverted Phraſes any otherwiſe, than as they expreſs the Truth about Chriſt's Satisfaction, we take not up only with a Set of Phraſes and Common Expreſſions without a Senſe or Meaning; nor in the *Criſpian* Senſe. It is the ſound Senſe, in which your Lordſhip hath uſed theſe Expreſſions, we Contend for; and ſome Words, Terms, and Phraſes we muſt uſe to Convey our Notions to Others by; and if it be declared, That our Sins were the near Impulſive Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings, that Chriſt was Obliged by Vertue of the Sanction of the Law to ſuffer, and that his Sufferings are more than Improperly, Analogically, and Materially, even Properly and Formally Penal, it will not only ſatisfie me, but all my Brethren, ſo far as I am capable of Underſtanding their true Senſe. For, my Lord, whatever others ſuggeſt, this is the plain State of the Caſe. And here we muſt fix our Foot, and deſire Satisfaction from our ſuſpected Brother Mr. *W.* being willing to give the moſt Satisfaction to all Men, as to the Caſe your Lordſhip mentions, of which more in the Cloſe.

My LORD,

The true Reaſon why we are ſo much concern'd in this Matter, is becauſe, as your Lordſhip doth very well know, it is the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction, that is by a Mighty Force Oppugned at this time, that one Method they have taken, as moſt likely to propagate their Notions by, is the pretending an Agreement between the Catholick Church and themſelves, that they have laboured this thing once and again; and that very lately, wherein they have been nibling at your Lordſhips Impregnable Defence of the Truth, in Oppoſition

unto

unto 'em; That in point of Satisfaction, they grant as much as Mr. *B.* for in the Agreement of the *Unitarians* with the Catholick Church, *p.* 36. it's affirm'd they hold, " That tho Chriſt did not undergo Puniſh-" ment, properly ſo called, yet he did ſo, in a Popu-" lar Senſe of the word *Puniſhment.* And, for the Suffering *in our ſtead*, which is rather tolerable and paſſable than proper, may be well admitted in this Senſe, *viz.* That, if the Lord Chriſt had not Suffered, we (the Actual Offenders) ſhould have been Puniſhed.

But, my Lord, if I miſtake not; *Grotius*, *Voſſius*, and what you have ſaid on this point clears it, that the Heart of the Controverſie lieth in the *Aſſerting* or *Denying* our Sins to be the near Impulſive, or *Properly* Meritorious *Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings*; and *his Sufferings to be properly Penal*; and that the *Defenders* of the Catholick Faith, contend earneſtly, that our Sins are the near Impulſive, or Meritorious Cauſe of *Chriſt's Sufferings*, and his Sufferings a *proper Puniſhment*. *Grotius*, in his Diſcourſe *de Satisfactione*, is expreſs, That one Cauſe which moved God to give up his Son to Sufferings, were our Sins as they deſerved puniſhment. *Cauſa altera, quæ Deum movit, ſunt Peccata noſtra Pœnam Commerentia.* Traditus eſt *Chriſtus* propter Peccata noſtra, Rom. 4. 25. *Ubi eſt Δια cum accuſativo:* Quæ apud Græcæ *Linguæ Autores ſacros* & profanos *utſiltatiſſima eſt nota* cauſæ Impulſivæ——*Quoties vero Phraſis iſta*, propter Peccata *Perpeſſionibus jungitur*, Diverſum a Cauſa Impulſiva *ſenſum non recipit.*——Cauſa *autem* Impulſiva eum *poſſit eſſe Multiplex*, hoc loco Meritoria *accipienda eſt. Agitur enim* de Pœna, *ut mox oſtendemus.* Peccata *autem* Pœnæ cauſa *ſunt*, *non aliter quam per modum Meriti.*——*Manet ergo illud Inconicuſſum Phraſin* ob peccata, cauſam *denotare* Impulſivam & quidem Meritoriam ——Intelligi hinc poteſt, quam non recte Socinus *neget*, *præter Dei & Chriſti Voluntatem*, Cauſam antecedentem, *mortis Chriſti poſſe reperiri:* Quod Plane adver-

 ſatur

ſatur Pauli *Dicto*, Gal. 2. 21. And as *Grotius*, in Oppoſition to *Socinus*, affirms *our Sins* to be an *Anteceding Impulſive*, *Meritorious Cauſe* of Chriſt's Sufferings, in like manner he is as poſitive, that Chriſt's Sufferings are *Penal*, or that the *Formal* Cauſe of Chriſt's Satisfaction, is his enduring the Puniſhment of our Sins. *Forma eſt* Pœnarum pro peccatis noſtris per ſolutio: *Quod Diſtricte* negat Socinus. *Quare hoc* ipſum *breviter probabimus*. This great Man in the Cloſe of thoſe Arguments, which he urged to prove Chriſt's Sufferings to be Penal declares. *His omnibus addi & illud poteſt*. Mortem ipſam, *hoc eſt Deſtructionem ejus Perſonæ, quam Corpus & animus conſtituunt* quatenus a *Deo infligitur, ſemper aliquam habere* pœnæ rationem: ——Facilimum eſſet *Demonſtratu*, ſi *id ageretur*, & Judæorum *veterum*, & Chriſtianorum *Perpetuam hanc fuiſſe ſententiam*, mortem qualemcunque hominis, **Peccati eſt Pœnam**——*Quoad Deum* Pœnæ rationem *habuerit Chriſti Paſſio & Mors*, minime eſt *dubitandum: Neque audiendæ ſunt* Socini *Interpretationes a Perpetuo vocum uſu citra Exemplum Recedentes.*

Voſſius in his Anſwer to *Ravenſpergerus* is more diſtinct and full: *Nihil igitur Certius eſt* (ſaith he) *quam negare* **Socinum** *ullas a Chriſto Pœnas eſſe* perſolutas *pro peccatis noſtris: Et hoc cum negat*, veras pœnas *intelligere*, & *non* pœnas κατακρισικὰς *acceptas, quatenus* Pœna *idem eſt quod* Afflictio: *Nam ubi videmus* Chriſtum bono noſtro Afflictum fuiſſe Agnoſcit, *ſed negat Afflictionem illam habere* **Rationem** Pœnæ: *Quæ ab Afflictione Differt*, ut *Species a genere: Quia omnis* Pœna *eſt* Affiictio: *At non Contra omnis* Afflictio *eſt* Pœnalis. *Quod ſi* Pœnæ *vocem late adeo extendamus*, ut *etiam non* veram pœnam, *hoc eſt* univerſe Afflictionem ſignet, negari *non poteſt Socinianos eſſe faſſarios* **Chriſtum pro nobis eſſe Punitum**, cap. 5.

His

Hic primus est Socini *Error*, quod etsi *interdum videatur* Peccata *habere pro* Causa antecedente, *tamen* Antecedentem Legitimam, *hoc* est, **vere, proprieque** *dictam*, *extra* voluntatem, *agnoscat* nullam: *ideoque in* sola finali *Causa acquiescat.*——*Locutio illa* ob, *vel* propter Peccata, *vel* pro peccatis, *quoties* Perpessionibus *Jungitur*, *nec in scripturis*, *nec in idoneo quoquam scriptore* **Finalem** *unquam*, *sed semper* **Antecedentem** *eamque* **Meritoriam** *significat* Causam. *Sane quamdiu contrarium Exemplum obducet nemo*, *citius* Herculi, *quod aiunt*, clava, *quam hoc nobis Argumentum* de *manibus extorquebitur.* ——*Qui* causam *dicit* finalem, *non idcirco fatetur* Efficientem: *Quin non si Christus in* bonum *nostrum mortuus est*, *eo* Pænas *subiit* pro nobis: *Cum alii esse* **fines** mortis *possint*, *quos* Socinus *agnoscit*. *At vero qui* causam *dicit* efficientem meritoriam, *is* finalem, & Antecedentem *comprehendit*, *ac* primario *&* directe **Antecedentem**, secundario, *autem significat*, & indirecte **finalem.** Id. Ibid. cap. 17.

But your Lordship having, in your excellent Discourse of *Christ's Sufferings*, so clearly, so distinctly, and fully stated the Controversie, as it lieth between the Orthodox and their Adversaries, I will only observe, more particularly, what has been already done in the General, that the Points, which in Mr. *W.* offends some Brethren, are,

1. That he takes the *Imputed Righteousness* of Christ in a sense different from the Common Sentiment of *Protestants*, in that, whereas they affirm his Sufferings and Obedience to be by *Vertue of the Penal Sanction* and *Precept* of the *Law of Works*, he takes them both to be by *Vertue* of the *Precepts* of the *Law of Mediation.*

2. That he holds Christ's Sufferings to arise *only* from the *Obligation* of the *Mediatorial Law*, whence it's impossible Sin should be *their Meritorious Cause*; or the *Suffer-*

Sufferings themſelves be *properly penal*; and therefore it is.

3. That he denieth ſuch a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, as is neceſſary to Explain the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction. Once more upon this bottom it was further ſuggeſted in the Report.

4. That the *Penal Sanction* of the Law of Works is by him vacated; and as I have here further cleared it, it's Preceptive Part is abrogated too: For, tho the *Matter* of what was Requir'd by *this Law* be taken into the *Law* of *Mediation*, and into the *New Law*; yet; there is no *Obedience*, nor *Sufferings* due from any by Vertue of the Obligation of the Law of Works; But as Chriſt's Obedience and Sufferings were only from the Obligation of the Law of Mediation, ſo the *Obedience*, we are bound to Render, and the *Sufferings* we are obnoxious unto for Sin, are only by Vertue of the Precept and penal Sanction of the New Law.

My LORD,

What I have offer'd in my Endeavour to point unto the Thing that doth in good earneſt moſtly Affect us, I do moſt humbly ſubmit to your Judgment, aſſuring you, that as what I have ſaid of Mr. *W.* has been after a moſt *Impartial Diſquiſition*, to find out his *true ſenſe*; ſo, if in any one Inſtance I have miſtaken him, I will, as ſoon as I underſtand ſo much, do him Right; for it is not *Victory*, nor the *Pleaſing* any one Party of Men, nor any Worldly Intereſt, nor a *Fondneſs* for *Antinomianiſm*, but a Zeal for Truth and the Common Cauſe of *Proteſtants*, in ſo important an Article as this of *Chriſt's Satisfaction*, that hath been my Motive to enter on this Controverſie. And, that I may give one Evidence more of my Sincerity herein, I will Conſider the *Propoſal* made, in the *Anſwer* to the *Report*, (which is in *P.* 27, 28.) where they ſet down eight Propoſitions for the Offended Brethren to agree with them in, five of which

are

re (as I take it) principally deſign'd againſt *Antinomi-niſm*, and the three other go againſt the other Ex-tream) and I make this *Return*.

1. That, in Oppoſition to *Antinomianiſm*, a Renoun-cing the ſeven Propoſitions, ſent from the United Mini-ſters by me unto the *Offended Brethren*, *January* 94. may ſuffice; in which it is more effectually done, as I do think, than in theſe five, which I do the rather pro-poſe, becauſe I do entirely agree with your Lordſhip, when you intimate, theſe Brethren *would do themſelves Right to Condemn them*; who, when I gave it 'em, Ap-proved not of it, not that they were Averſe to Re-nounce the Errours therein mention'd; but becauſe not one of the *Forty Nine*, whoſe Names were ſet to the *Te-ſtimonial* before *Goſpel Truth ſtated*, had Recall'd their Hands; or expreſſed ſo much Diſſatisfaction with what Mr. *W.* had Aſſerted, as was expected: Beſides, having ſince Diſcourſed ſeveral of 'em, I find 'em very willing to declare their Diſlike of the Propoſitions, and am perſwaded they'll chearfully do it, whenever ſatisfacti-on ſhall be given to what Mr. *W.* is charged with.

2. The three *Propoſitions* about a *Change of Perſons*; Chriſt's *being our Surety*, and his *Anſwering for us* the **Obligations** *of the violated Law of Works*, are not ſuf-ficient to Remove our Fears, concerning his *Unſoundneſs* in *theſe Points*, I will therefore humbly move it for your Lordſhips Thoughts, whether Mr. *W.* if really agreed with your Lordſhip, as is pretended in theſe Points, can in reaſon refuſe to expreſs his Approval of the fol-lowing *Propoſitions*.

1. A Change of *Perſons* between Chriſt and us, in the ſound ſenſe implies ſuch a Subſtitution of Chriſt into our place and ſtead as is neceſſary to our Sins, being the Meritorious Cauſe of Chriſt's Sufferings, and his Suf-ferings a proper *Puniſhment* of our Sins, for the Satis-faction of Divine Juſtice, that *whoever believes on him*, *may be acquited* and *ſaved*: But, it is not intended that the

the Filth of our Sins, which is distinct from the Guilt, was upon Christ, or that he was any otherwise a Criminal in God's Account, than by the *Imputation* of our Sins unto him.

2. That by Christ's being our *Surety* is meant, that he, by the Father's Will and his own Consent, came *under* the *Obligation* of the Violated Law of Works, to expiate our Sins, purchase Eternal Life for all that Believe, and Faith with every other Grace, for the Elect. But it's not intended, that we were Legally Reputed to *make Satisfaction*; or purchase Eternal Life.

3. By *Christ's Answering for us the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works*, is intended, that whereas the *Law* obliged us to die for our Sins, Christ by the Father's Will and his own Consent, came under the *Obligation* of this Law, and by *Vertue of it's Penal Sanction*, suffered in our place and stead; and whereas we were after we had sinned, still obliged to yield perfect Obedience; Christ came under the *Obligation* of the *Precepts* of this *Law* too, and *perfectly obeyed*; that upon the Account of his *Passive* and *Active Obedience*, Believers might be forgiven, and entituled unto Eternal Life: But it's not intended, that the *sense* of the *Law of Works* should be, that if we or Christ Obeyed, we should Live, and if Christ suffered, we should not Die *tho we sinned:* Nor that Believers are *Justified* by the *Law of Works*, but by the Gospel. For, tho a Righteousness answering the Obligations of the Violated Law of Works, be necessary to our Justification; yet we are not justified by the Law, because we *did it not our selves*, as the Law requir'd it; But the Lord *Christ's doing it*, is by the Grace of the Gospel bestowed on us and accounted ours, and thus they who Believe are Justified.

My LORD,

By what I have here suggested, you will see what it is that doth mostly stick with us, where the Wound is, and

and what is moſt likely to Heal; as alſo what *my ſenſe is* of *your Lordſhips Letter to Mr.* W. and how ſenſible I am of the Obligations your Lordſhip has laid upon all them who truly own the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction.

That it is ſo much upon your Lordſhips Heart to prevent all *Needleſs*, as well as *Dangerous Controverſies* amongſt us, and an Apprehenſion you will with Freedom and Impartiality give your ſenſe of what I have here Repreſented to your Lordſhip, give Life to my Hopes, that our Differences will be happily compoſed, and that we ſhall unite our ſtrength againſt the *Antinomian* and *Socinian* Adverſary. I am,

My LORD,

London, *Jan.* 17. 1698.

Your Lordſhips moſt Obliged Humble Servant and Honourer,

Stephen Lobb.

To

To the Reverend Dr. Edwards, *Principal of* Jesus Colledge, Oxon.

SIR,

THERE being some parts of three of your Letters to Mr. *W.* printed; the Honour I have for you, in regard to your Learning, soundness in the Faith, and Great Services you have done the *Church*, in Defence of the Truth against the *Socinians*, obligeth me to Represent unto you, *Why it was that your Writings were Referred unto*, by some Dissenters in this City; And, *what is farther desired of you.*

To the *First.*

It must be observed, That this Nation having been of late Years pestered with Swarms of *Socinian Books*, and their Errors, so amazingly prevailing amongst many, it was apprehended, that our greatest Danger would be from the Writings of some; who, tho they expressed their Dislike of *Socinianism*, yet vented such Notions, as had a Tendency to promote the Designs of our Adversaries, who were apprehensive of it, and would not lose so considerable an Advantage.

The Truth of this appeared, *first* from the *Use* they have made of what had been Written by some in the *Church*, which awakening sundry Persons of great Abilities, and excellent Learning, *viz.* My *Lord of Worcester*, *your Self*, Dr. *S.* and others. There hath been such a Defence of the Truth; and, to the lasting Praise of your *University*, in a Remarkable Instance, such Expressions of your Zeal against those Opinions, which have been heretofore improved, not only to Distract

ſtract and Divide the Orthodox, but to Propagate the *Racovian Faith*, as has Confounded, and in a great meaſure, Silenced the Enemies to the Bleſſed *Trinity*, our *Saviour's Divinity* and *Satisfaction*.

At laſt theſe Gentlemen take notice of the Conteſts amongſt the *Diſſenters*, and one of their principal Writers, *viz.* the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, to the end he might the more plauſibly Expoſe thoſe Parts of the Chriſtian Faith, which relate to *Juſtification*, inſinuated as if they had been ſuch *Abſtruſe Matters*, that tho the Diſſenters contended ſo fiercely about 'em, as to divide Communion, and ſeparate upon them; yet, their *Teachers* confeſs, they underſtand not what it is, that our Differences are about. And whereas Mr. *Gaylard* had ſuggeſted that ſome *Arminians* were joyned in *Confederacy* with the *Socinians*; one of the *Unitarian Scriblers*, in his *Apology* for the *Parliament*, P. 24, 25. takes occaſion from this Paſſage, to Repreſent the *Socinians* as very *Numerous* and *Formidable*, boldly Charging, not only almoſt all the *Church*, but a *Moiety* of the *Preſbyterians* for being ſuch; whereupon 'twas thought expedient to give a brief Account of what it was, that in the Upſhot the Controverſie among us, was chiefly about; and that the *Socinians* might not get any Advantage, the Author of the *Remarks*, without the leaſt Intimation, that his *Presbyterian* Brethren did *Socinianize*, owned, as what could not be denied, that there were a Set of Men in the World, who may be juſtly termed *Socinianizing-Arminians*; adding, that it hath been ſufficiently proved by the Learned Dr. *Edwards* of *Oxford*, and others, at which time, as appears from what he ſaith, he had his Eye on the *Third part* of your *Preſervative*, p. 80, 81. and, with Grief, beholding how juſt your Complaints were of them, who ſeem *too Unconcern'd* about theſe Matters, when you ſay *Part.* 2. *p.* 126. 'Certainly whatever Excuſes we 'may make; or, with whatſoever *Specious Names*, or Titles

p. 146. *M. R.*

c Titles we may think fit to varniſh over our *Silence*
c and *Reſervedneſs* in this Affair, yet all unprejudic'd
c Standers by will account it not the Effects of *Chriſtian*
c *Moderation*, but of *Unchriſtian Lukewarmneſs*, if not
c *Perfidiouſneſs* in the Cauſe of God and his Holy Reli-
c gion. The Author of the *Remarks* agreeing with
c you in theſe Particulars, declared *p.* 24. " It cannot
c be denied but that we muſt be very *Cautious*, in a Day
c wherein the *Socinians* are ſo bold, that we give them
c no *Advantages*, *Countenance*, or *Reputation*, either by
c a *Shineſs* to Teſtifie againſt their Corrupting the Do-
c ctrine of a *Change of Perſons*; or by yielding, that
c to ſay Chriſt ſuffered *in our ſtead* is ſufficient to make
c it manifeſt, they hold a Change of Perſons in a
c ſound ſenſe, and do not *Socinianize* in this parti-
c cular.

The Reaſon then, why Application was made to your *Preſervative*, was to ſhow from a Perſon of your
c Learning and Judgment, that there are Men, who,
c tho they hold, *Chriſt died in our ſtead*, do yet deny
c his Death to be a *proper Puniſhment*, and conſequently
c that the *Permutation*, or *Change of Perſons*, they are
c for is not ſuch as is neceſſary to Explain our *Saviour's*
c *Satisfaction*. And, Sir, I am perſwaded you are not herein Miſrepreſented by the *Author of the Remarks*, that Mr. *W.* himſelf found the Quotation too Juſt and Fair for him to attempt an Eluding it, and therefore to the End he might get ſome Countenance to his Suggeſtions about *your differing* from the *Remarks* in the alledged Inſtances, he procures from you three Letters to another Purpoſe. For, by what he has publiſhed of them, it's clear, that howſoever he has worded his firſt *Quæry*, the Explication you give, of a *Permutation of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, is no other than what the *Author of the Remarks* is moſt entirely for.

The 2d Enquiry is, Of what you judge of Mr. *W.* his Notion of a *Permutation of Perſons*; to which he ſaith, that

that whatever Mr. *W.* holds, the Paſſages taken out of your *Preſervative*, expreſs the thing for which they were produced:

To the *Third* he agrees with you in your Oppoſition to Dr. *Criſp*, and can't find any thing in *the Letters*, contravening what he ſaid of your Opinion concerning theſe *Socinianizing Remonſtrants*, who ſay Chriſt dyed in *our ſtead*, and yet his Sufferings were but a *vicarious Puniſhment*, and the Permutation they are for, conſiſtent with the denial of a *proper ſatisfaction*, which effectually confutes the Argument of thoſe Brethren, who declare, that Mr. *W.* cannot, by the Phraſe [**There is no Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us**] intend the Denial of a Change in a ſound Senſe; becauſe in that very *Page* he affirms, that *Chriſt died in our ſtead.*

But Sir, Is the affirming that Chriſt died *in our ſtead*, ſufficient in this Crafty and Deſigning Age, to evince, that the *Affirmer* doth hold a Change of Perſons in a ſound Senſe? You know it is not; and that therefore you differ not from the *Author* of the *Remarks* in this Inſtance, and that the Author has not miſ-repreſented you.

Sir, Altho you have very Generouſly, and with Candour, expreſſed your Charitable Opinion of Mr. *W.* his *Orthodoxy*; yet I am perſwaded, 'tis with a reſolution to conſider what may be farther offered, touching Mr. *W*'s True Senſe, and that, if he really entertains any Notions about a *Commutation of Perſons* between Chriſt and us, different from what you have aſſerted, you will not be ſorry to underſtand ſo much.

If you have judged too Charitably of Mr. *W.* as with humbleſt ſubmiſſion, I crave leave to ſay, I think you have; yet conſidering what Arts he has uſed to conceal his Opinions, when an open owning 'em would hinder their Propagation, his profeſſed Deteſtation of *Antinomianiſm*, his repreſenting all his Adverſaries to

be of the *Criſpian Sect*; and his frequent Proteſtations of Zeal for the Common Faith of *Proteſtants* in the Controverted Articles, you have not in the leaſt ſurprized me, and I can only ſay concerning it, that your Charity in this Inſtance, if it hath exceeded, is the evincement of a moſt Noble, Chriſtian Spirit; and in Confidence there are many Excellent Perſons in the Church who are under the influence of the ſame Chriſtian Principle with *My Lord of Worceſter* and your ſelf, I look on it as a good *Omen*, and the laying of a ſure Foundation of a better Underſtanding amongſt *Proteſtants of different Sentiments* in Matters of leſſer importance. However,

2. A Conviction that Mr. *W*'s Notions are not ſo *Orthodox* as you apprehend 'em to be, moves me, with the Profoundeſt Reſpect, to beſeech you to weigh the *Conſiderations* offered to my *Lord of Worceſter*, and what I here preſent unto you, and return your Thoughts of the things offered. I have declared to *his Lordſhip*, that I am perſwaded Mr. *W.* doth, with Mr. *B.* deny our ſins to be the *meritorious Cauſe* of *Chriſt's Sufferings*, or his Sufferings to be a *proper Puniſhment*, and for a fuller *clearing* thus much, I will add ſomewhat more, after I have obſerv'd unto you, That if *Chriſt's ſufferings* be not *ex obligatione Legis*, if not by vertue of the *Pœnal Sanction* of a *violated Law*, our Sins cannot be their *meritorious cauſe*: You know, that *Calamities* or *Afflictions* are but the *Matter* of a *proper Puniſhment*, and not its *formal* Reaſon, which lies in a relation of that *matter* to its *meritorious Cauſe*; and that *Sin* cannot be the *meritorious cauſe* of *Sufferings*, if they be not from an *obligation*, which is by *vertue* of the *Sanction* of the *Law*; That, if they be not from any ſuch *obligation*, if only *ex obligatione ſponſionis*, they can be but *materially* a puniſhment, they can be but *vice pœnæ*, or a *vicarious*, not a *proper* puniſhment. If then, I do prove that Mr. *W.* doth, with Mr. *B.* reſolve *Chriſt's Sufferings* wholly into a *Conformity* unto the *Precept* of the *Mediatorial Law*, they

they cannot, according unto him, be *ex obligatione legis*, or by *Vertue of the Sanction of the Law*; They can be but *acts of obedience* and *Dominion*, not acts of *Juſtice*.

1. That Mr. *B.* reſolves the whole, Chriſt *did* and *ſuffered*, into **acts of Obedience**, is plain from what he has, in his *End of Doctrinal Controverſies*, *p.* 125. *&c.* where, writing of the *Law of Mediation* he ſays, §. 15. *Tho if Chriſt as a Creature had ſinned, he had deſerved Puniſhment, yet the Suppoſition being of a Thing impoſſible, by reaſon of the Union of the Divine Nature, it is* **improper** *to talk of any* Pœnal Part *of the Law, that was given him. For* pœnal Laws *are for thoſe, that by* fear *have need to be* reſtrained *from Sin, or conſtrained to Duty, which Chriſt needed not.*

Mr. *W.* affirms the ſame, as I have obſerved, in my *Letter to his Lordſhip*, p. 24. ſo that they are both Expreſs in declaring, *That no* pœnal *Sanction belongs to the Law of Redemption*; and therefore, ſeeing Chriſt was under the *formal obligation* of no Law but the *Mediatorial*, They cannot hold, *That Chriſt's ſufferings were properly* pœnal, which was the true Reaſon why Mr. *B.* who was not afraid to ſpeak his Mind, ſo frequently inculcates it, That *Chriſt's Sufferings* are only *materially*, not **properly Penal.**

2. Mr. *B.* adds, *Chriſt's entire righteouſneſs (as before his Exaltation)* habitual, active, **paſſive**, *Elevated by Union with the Divine Perfection, was his* Performance of *the Condition of his Covenant with the Father, and his* performance *of that Condition, was his* meritorious Title *to Gods promiſed Effects, And that as it was* one entire Righteouſneſs *or* Condition **performed**, *and our Juſtification and Salvation are part of thoſe* promiſed Effects. *Therefore it is Abuſive Subtilty to* divide *Chriſt's Performance into* Little Parcels, *and then ſay, this* Parcel *is imputed to me for this uſe, and that for that uſe, and by the one he* merited this, *and by the other* that, *when (tho each Part had its Proper Reaſon yet) it was* **only** *the* **entire** **perfor-**

mance, *and that was the Condition of the Benefits, and ſo of our Juſtification and Salvation.*

Mr. *W.* ſaith the ſame thing, *Man made Righteous*, p. 114. *&c.* Where after he had enumerated the Particulars obſerved by Chriſt in obedience to the *Mediatorial Law*, he adds, *That the Performance of theſe Conditions is the* Legal *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and* that, *for which we are juſtified*, &c.

Thus, they both Reſolve the *whole* of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, even his very Sufferings, into the *Performance of the Conditions* of the *Mediatorial Covenant*, and affirm them to be but *Acts of Obedience*, and conſequently, acts of *Dominion*, not of *Punitive Juſtice*, for as Mr. *W.* himſelf has it, they are no otherwiſe a *compleat formal Righteouſneſs*, either *active* or *paſſive*, but as they are in Obedience to the *Mediatorial Law*, and therefore cannot be **properly Penal.** But,

3. That Mr. *W.* makes *Chriſt's Sufferings* to be only *ex obligatione ſponſionis*, is clear from his repeated Declarations, *That Chriſt was never under that Obligation, under which we were.* If Chriſt's *Sufferings* were *ex obligatione Legis*, by vertue of the Sanction of a Law, it muſt be of the Law we violated. There was no other Law that had a *Pœnal Sanction* for Chriſt to come under. But he oft ſaith, That Chriſt was never under any Law or Obligation, but where he was *Principal* and *alone*, which could not be in the Law of Works.

To ſtrengthen this Conſideration, it muſt not paſs without *Remark*, That as he confines the Obligation Chriſt lay under, either to do or ſuffer, unto the *Precept of this Mediatorial Law*, ſo he doth, not only make Chriſt's *Sufferings* to be *Acts of Obedience*, but to clear it, that he makes 'em to be but *acts of Obedience*, and no more, he placeth **their Efficacy** in their being ſuch **Acts.** So *p.* 21. *The* **Efficacy** *of Chriſt's Sufferings depend much upon their being acts of Obedience*; And that he reſolves the Cauſes of our Salvation entirely

tirely into the Acts of Obedience, as such, he doth, in the same *Page* add " The Will of God *appointing* " and *accepting* this Atonement, and the Will of " Christ *obeying*, and freely *performing* what was ap- " pointed, are *that* we are *saved* by. What Words can more fully express his Opinion, that the whole Christ *did* or *suffered* for our Salvation, arises only *ex obligatione sponsionis*, which is as much as to say, That the whole of Christ's satisfaction is only unto the *Holy Will of God*: And that he means no more by a *proper Satisfaction*, is easily proved from his affirming, *P.* 43. " That Christ's *active Obedience* was in a very *Proper* " Sense *Satisfactory*. But how *satisfactory* any other ways than by being *Pleasing* unto the *Divine Will*. If then a *Proper* Satisfaction doth, in the Judgment of Mr. *W.* lie in what is acceptable and pleasing unto God, Is it not past doubt, that he leaves My *Lord of Worcester*, your self, and all sound *Protestants* in this Article?

4. Mr. *W.* doth *explicitely* own the Necessary and Inevitable Consequences of what I charge upon him, which is another Consideration, confirming me in the Thoughts I have of his leaving the *Reformed* in these Points.

1. If the whole of Christ's Obedience and Sufferings be resolved into *acts of Obedience* unto the Precept of the *Mediatorial Law*, then it unavoidably follows, he cannot hold that Christ rendered a *Formal Obedience* to the Precepts of the Violated Law, or that his Sufferings were by Vertue of its *Sanction*. The most he can consistently believe, is, That Christ's doing and suffering, in obedience to the Mediatorial *Law*, is in the Room and Stead of his fulfilling the Righteousness of the *Moral Law*, so that, tho, as it lies in obeying the Law of Mediation, it is a *Legal* Righteousness, yet in regard to the Violated Law it is a *Pro-Legal Righteousness*, and the Obedience and Punishment but *Vicarious*.

This Sir, is freely owned (in his *Preface P.*7.) where he calls the Righteousness of Christ our *Pro-Legal Righteousness*, which (he saith *P.* 191.) " Christ did " in his *own* **Legal Person**; I say *LEGAL*, be- " cause the Divine Dignity of his Person gave the " **Legal**, yea the **Supra-Legal** Value, in God's " Account to what he suffered.

That this **Pro-Legal** *Righteousness* is, in his Esteem, a **vicarious** *Obedience* and *Punishment*, is manifest from his own Words, *p.* 63. " The *Law* of " Works did not require or appoint a *vicarious Pu-* " *nishment* or *Obedience* from a *Sponsor* for others, but " *limited* both to the *Persons originally subject to the* " *Law*, whereas the *Covenant of Redemption* appoint- " ed *this* [namely this vicarious Punishment and O- bedience.]

Thus Sir, You see, how full he is in owning the natural Consequence of reducing the whole of Christ's Undertaking only to that Obligation which is by Vertue of the Mediatorial Precept, to which I might add the *tanquam* and *quasi*'s which he, as well as *Limborch*, hath used, but I forbear.

2. The *Sufferings* of Christ being only *ex obligatione sponsionis*, and not by *vertue of the Sanction of the Law*, they could not be a *Judicial Act of God*, he could not be condemned, nor could Sentence Pass upon him; nor according to any Sentence, could he be executed; for where no Obligation to Punishment by the Sanction of the Law, there is no *Guilt* in any sense; where no *Guilt*, no condemning, no *Passing a Sentence justly*, nor an *Execution*. The connection there is between the Laws given unto Rational Creatures, and their enforcement by certain Sanctions; and between these Sanctions and that *Punitive Justice* which is *natural in God*, is such, that whoever falls under the *Penal Sanction*, is thereupon Guilty, that is, obliged to a Punishment which flows from Justice; but

they,

they, who are not under the *Sanction of the Law*, who are not obliged to Puniſhment, Juſtice, *Punitive Juſtice* hath nothing to do with them, either to condemn or ſentence them, or to ſee the Sentence executed; ſo that, if Chriſt were only under the Obligation of the *Mediatorial Law*, in which is no *Pœnal Sanction*, Juſtice hath nothing againſt him, and he cannot be Arraigned before God's Tribunal, nor be proceeded againſt in a *Judicial way*, nor be *really Guilty* in God's Eſteem, nor be condemned nor ſentenced to a *vindictive Puniſhment*, nor can his Sufferings be a *Judicial Act*, or make ſatisfaction to God's Law, or to his Juſtice.

Theſe things you have ſo fully cleared in your *Preſervative*, that nothing on this occaſion, lies on me to do, but render you my Thanks for the great ſervice you have done therein to our Holy Religion, and obſerve, that, you are, I am perſwaded in the Right, when you ſay, That [redacted] Guilt lieth in an Obligation to Puniſhment, ariſing from the *Sanction of the Law*, which flows from *Punitive Juſtice*, which is natural in God; And that to the end, Chriſt's *Sufferings* might *ſatisfie* this Juſtice, 'tis neceſſary that they be a Judicial Act of God; that Chriſt be charged with the Guilt of our ſins, Condemned, Sentenced, and accordingly Executed for 'em.

But of theſe things not a Word in Mr. *W.* that I can find, but contrarily he ſeems to go no farther than to grant, that Chriſt was eſteemed by *Men* a *Tranſgreſſor*, and *Arraigned as ſuch*.

Sir, Miſtake me not, I don't believe, That the *Perſonal Guilt* of our Sins, making Chriſt the committer of Drunkenneſs, Idolatry, *&c.* or that their *filth* and *turpitude* were transferred upon Chriſt. Nothing more abhorred by me than ſuch abominable Blaſphemies! However, I am perſwaded, and I think, it is in concurrence with the Generation of the Orthodox,

dox, That the Lord Jesus Christ voluntarily on the Fathers Invitation, coming under the *Sanction* of the Violated Law, was justly charged with the Guilt of our Sins, found Guilty, Condemned, Sentenced and Executed, as such, even by that God who *laid upon him the iniquity of us all.* And seeing his *Sufferings* were a *Judicial act* of God, it could not be otherwise; For Justice condemns none to Punishment but upon the account of Sin, and punisheth none but under the Notion of *Criminals*, if Jesus Christ had been only Treated *as if he had been a Criminal*, and died not *as a Criminal in foro Poli*, his *Sufferings* could not have been a proper Punishment, flowing from that *punitive Justice* which is *natural in God.*

Cloppenburch therefore, who I think was far from being tainted with *Antinomianism*, expresseth the *Common Faith* of *Protestants* in this Point, very happily. *Cum ergo Christo imputata a Deo dicimus* peccata nostra, *VERE etiam id factum intelligimus, id est, VERE* Christum, *licet non in se, in NOSTRA tamen* Persona *a Deo* Judicatum, *& habitum fuisse* Peccatorem, *cuia* vi sponsionis *UNA nobiscum PERSONA, in* Judicio *censetur eodemque* Jure, *quo nos REUS peragitur utpote peccati nostri, ea ratione Particeps, sine LABE tamen* aliqua in se *derivata.* Enarrat in Isa. 53. 6 Lect. 6. *Vossius* also hath it, *Christum peccatorum nostrorum pœnam in se suscepisse, quia non simpliciter pro nobis; sed ut* peccator, *sive pro* peccatoribus *mortuus dicitur.* Resp. ad Judic Ravensperg. c. 17.

But in opposition hereunto, according to the Principles of Mr. *W.* Christ could not be justly charged with the Guilt of our sins, and therefore not be esteemed a *Criminal*, nor die *as a sinner*; for he holds, Christ was never under any other *formal* obligation than that of the Law of Mediation, which had no *pœnal sanction*, and his *Sufferings* could be but an *Act of Dominion*, and to Clear it, that he Owns thus much,

much, I will offer Two or Three Conſiderations which are of weight with me.

1. If *Chriſt ſuſtained not the Perſon of Sinners*, he could not be charged *with our Guilt*. To the charging Chriſt juſtly with *Guilt*, 'twas neceſſary, that he be in our Perſon; ſo that if Chriſt and Believers do not conſtitute *one Perſon*, in ſome ſenſe or other, he could not be charged with our Guilt. And what ſaith Mr. *W.* to this? he is poſitive, 'That Head and Members " do not make *One Perſon*, but *One Body*; yea one *Spi-* " *rit* in Chriſt and us, doth not make one *Perſon*, " unleſs you will make the Holy Ghoſt to be an *ani-* " *mating Soul* to the Body, and to be the chief con- " ſtitutive Part of the whole Perſon: *What will not* " *a deluded, vain Fancy expoſe Men to at laſt?* Man made Righteous, p. 194. But Sir, Are all ſuch as hold, That Chriſt and Believers make *one Myſtical Perſon*, under the Deluſion of a *vain Fancy?* What muſt we then think of all the *Reformed?* What of the Learned *Biſhop Davenant*, who, I thought, had, in oppoſition to *Papiſts*, about *Juſtification*, given a true account of the Faith of *Proteſtants*, and yet he ſaith, *Legem in nobis impleri* per *Chriſtum*, *quocum*, *in* **unam Perſonam** *coaleſcimus*, *ex ſuo* Aquinate *diſcant Pontificii*: **Chriſtus** (inquit ille) *& Membra ejus*, *ſunt* **una Perſona Myſtica**, *unde opera* Capitis *ſunt aliquo modo opera* **Membrorum**, &c. **Prælect.** de Juſtit. cap. 52.

But Mr. *A.* in his defence of Mr. *W.* fears not to ſay the *Phraſe* [*Of Chriſt's ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*] can ſignifie nothing but that Chriſt was *Perſonatus Hiſtrio*. His Words (*p.* 53.) are, " What can " theſe Expreſſions ſignifie [*viz. Chriſt ſuſtained the Perſon of Sinners*] but that *Chriſt* wore the *Mark*, the *Vizor*, the *Diſguiſe* of ſinners, that he was *Perſonatus Hiſtrio?* Like the *Stage-Player* that puts on the Perſon of a King, when indeed he is but ſome *ſorry fellow*,

fellow; his Words are, *What can these Expressions signifie, but that Christ is* personatus Histrio? As if it was impossible for them to bear any other sense? and as if the *Libertines* (of whom *Polyander a Kerchove*, in his *Concert. Anti-Socin.* 1 *Disp.* 13. *Sect.* 18.) had been in the right, when they *blasphemously* infer from the Assertion, That Christ sustains our Person in his *Sufferings*, *Eodem modo se gesserit, quo* Histriones *se gerunt, in suis Tragediis*, &c. Of like Nature is that other Assertion of his, p. 9. "The sense of the "Phrase [a *Change of Persons between Christ and us*] "must be, that Christ was Changed for us, and we "for Christ. As if its Import could be no less than that, as Christ died for Our *Sins*, we died for Christ's *Sins*; an Assertion that cannot signifie less than the Denial of a Change of Persons in every sense, and yet this is not only written in *Defence* of Mr. *W.* but 'tis in that very Book, for which Mr. *W.* applauds the Author.

If then we set these things together, it must (as I humbly apprehend) put it out of Doubt, that when they speak of Christ as suffering for us, they take the *Person* spoken of, *abstractly* as *innocent*, and therefore as a subject uncapable of a Proper Punishment, inflicted by God's Justice upon him.

2. The *Third Paper* being so compos'd as to pass by what did most effectually provide against the *suspected Errors*, confirms me in this Opinion. For an Orthodox Assertion is rejected as what could not be *safely* retained. In the *Rebuke*, *P.*28. it's said, "That "the Brethren, who were engaged in drawing up "this *Third Paper* Retained so much of the first, as "they *SAFELY could*; and in *P.* 29. They kept to "the *First Paper*, saving in some Expressions and "Phrases which were judged of *dubious sense*, or dan-"gerous consequence, or carried the face of some *dan-*"*gerous tendency*. In *P.* 30. "They did grant so

"*much*

" *much* as the *found ſenſe could bear*. So that the Terms and Expreſſions which were waved, were in the eſteem of Mr. *A.* and ſo far as we may believe him, of Mr. *W.* and others, ſuch as are *UNSAFE*, *of dubious Senſe*, *dangerous Conſequence*, *Dangerous Tendency and unſound*; amongſt which this is one [namely *Chriſt's anſwering for us the* **Obligation** *of the violated Law:* Whence it is, that from this Alteration, between the Two Papers, thus Qualified, I conclude, That the Third Paper was drawn up, as if it had been with a Deſign to cover what Mr. *W.* is charged with; for, by their turning [*Chriſt's Anſwering for us the* **Obligation** *of the Violated Law*] into [*His Anſwering for our Violation of the Law*] they Cleared it, that by Chriſt's Sufferings [for *our Sin*] which is the ſame with [for *our Violation of the Law*] no more is intended than a **Final Cauſe**, or at moſt, that *Sin is* but *the Occaſion*, or *Pro-Cauſa meritoria* of Chriſt's Sufferings, whereupon a Subſcription may be to this *Third Paper*, conſiſtently with a Belief, that Chriſt's Sufferings were not *ex Obligatione Legis*, that our *Sins were not their meritorius Cauſe*, and his Sufferings not a proper Puniſhment, which neceſſarily implies, that our Saviour could not be Juſtly charged with our Guilt, appear as Guilty, be ſentenced and executed as ſuch. And Conſonantly enough, he doth in his *Anſwers* to the *Report*, propoſe the Declaring [That Chriſt was not in God's Account a *Criminal*] as a Term of Accomodation.

Sir, Theſe *Conſiderations* in *Conjunction* with what I have humbly offered to my *Lord of Worceſter*, and the Obſervations I have made in my Cloſeſt-Converſes with him, perſwade me to Believe, he doth moſt entirely agree with the Learned Mr. *Baxter*, in the *Denyal of ſuch a Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, as is neceſſary to explain the Doctrine of a *True*, *Real*, and *Proper Satisfaction*.

There are other *Reaſons* I could offer, to ſhow, why

I

I Judge thus of Mr. *W.* but Apprehending, that what I have already ſuggeſted will fully ſatisfie you, or at leaſt, move you to caſt your Eye once more upon his *Man made Righteous*, with ſo much Jealouſie as is neceſſary to be a *Ballance* to thoſe Charitable Apprehenſions, you have ſo Generouſly entertained of his Orthodoxy, I will forbear to mention, beſeeching you to Believe, that it's only a Zeal for Truth, that hath influenced me to enter on this Vexatious, but Neceſſary *Undertaking*; for I am fully convinced, that as ſome, to the End they may keep themſelves at a Diſtance from the *Antinomian Dotages*, paſs over into the *Socinian* Tents, ſo others, to Avoid the *Peſtilential Hereſies* of *Socinus*, and whatever hath a Tendency thereunto, turn *Antinomians*; and both theſe Abominations, being equally Vile in my Eye, as I have formerly done my part to give Check to the *Antinomians*, I think my ſelf no Leſs obliged to oppoſe, not only the *Socinian* Errours, but the *Dogmata* of **Epiſcopius**; wiſhing, that my Orthodox, Brethren, inſtead of Cenſuring me, would lay to Heart what you preſs, (in your *Preſervative*, Part III. p. 184.) upon an Awful Obſervation you have made, and others, if they will but look abroad, may make, when you tell us, 'We have ſeen many Exam-'ples of *this*, in the Age, we live in, *viz.* of Men, hav-'ing once Forſaken the *Common*, and *Received Truths* 'of *Chriſtianity*, that have afterwards fallen from one 'Wild and Wicked Opinion to another; until at 'length, they have ſhaken hands with all *Religions*, and 'have exalted themſelves above *Law*, and *Goſpel*, *Ordi-'nances*, and *Revelations*, to the Diſhonour of God, and 'Scandal of Religion, the Reproach and Blemiſh of our '*State*, and *Nation*, all which have highly ſuffered by 'the *Wild*, and *Frantick* Opinions of theſe Men, and the '*Lewd Franks*, which they have play'd in Purſuance 'thereof.

'All which ſhould *Caution*, and *Affright* Men from

'*giving*

'giving *way to Errours*, in Religion; which conſidering 'the miſchievous Conſequences of them, ſhould not be 'accounted ſuch *ſlight* and *inconſiderable* matters, as 'ſome Men have Repreſented them, who, out of a *well-* 'meant, perhaps, but *miſtaken* Notion of **Meekneſs**, 'Charity, and **Moderation**, have given too great 'Countenance and Encouragement to ſuch *Erroneous* 'Opinions, and thereby may be ſaid to have Occaſion- 'ed ſome Inconveniencies to ſay no worſe of them, 'which have happened thereupon, and which are much 'eaſier Complained of than Remedied. Inſtead 'therefore of ſoothing ſuch Men in their Errors, we 'ought (as I ſaid before) to lay before them, and others, 'the **Great Danger** they are in, by Reaſon of them; 'and though we may have no great Hopes of doing 'any good upon ſuch Perſons themſelves, who think 'themſelves too Good, and too Wiſe to be Taught, 'and make but a *Jeſt* of all, that is Charitably Offer'd 'for their Inſtruction; yet, poſſibly it may make ſome 'Impreſſion upon others, and Prevent their being Per- 'verted, eſpecially, when they are Informed, that the 'Condition of ſuch, who are infected wtth theſe He- 'retical Opinions, is not only **Deplorable**; but, in a 'manner, **Deſperate**, there being but very few of 'them; who, when they are once Entangled in theſe 'Errors, have ever Recovered themſelves out of the '**Snare of the Devil**, as the Experience of all A- 'ges aſſure us.

Thus, Honoured Sir, I have Impartially Repreſent- ed unto you my Opinion of Mr. *VV.* his Notions, with my Humble Requeſt, you will Freely Deliver your Thoughts of them, and ſhow how Hazardous it is for any, to fall in with the Notions of *Epiſcopius*, of which many, in their Flight from *Antinomianiſm*, are in moſt Danger.

Sir, There is one Thing more that I cannot forbear mentioning unto you, it is, that ſince I have Finiſhed

the

the Conſiderations, here ſent you, A *Student*, who can from *Utrick*, the Laſt Summer, hath put into my hands a Diſſertation of the Learned *Leydecker*, wherein ſaith, 'Et ſane ego non adeo probare queo Theologiam D. **Williams**, quam vis ſe *Antinomis* oppoſuerit, ut Condonem Errores *Baxterianis* ſimiles, aut Aequales. Diſſert. Hiſtorico-Theolog. Sect 38. And that Mr. *B.* hath eſpouſed the **Epiſcopian Error** in the Article of our *Saviour's* ſatisfaction, ſeems to me very evident. But, Craving Pardon for this Freedom, I will only add that I am,

Honoured Sir,

London,
Feb. 12.
16,8.

Your Reſpectful, and
moſt Humble Servant

Stephen Lobb.

FINIS.